



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
HELD ON FEBRUARY 14, 2020
AT 1957 E STREET NW/STATE ROOM**

Present: Provost Blake; Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Deans Jeffries and Lach; University Librarian Henry; Interim Dean Bracey; Executive Committee Chair Marotta-Walters; Professors Brown, Cottrol, Dugan, Gupta, Gutman, Harrington, Hill, Johnson, Markus, Mylonas, Orti, Perry, Pintz, Rain, Rao, Rehman, Roddis, Sarkar, Schumann, Schwartz, Sidawy, Subiaul, Swaine, Tekleselassie, Tielsch, Wagner, Wilson, Wirtz, Yezer, and Zara.

Absent: President LeBlanc; Deans Bass, Brigety, Feuer, Goldman, and Mehrotra; Interim Deans Deering and Wahlbeck; Registrar Amundson; Professors Agnew, Briscoe, Cordes, Costello, Eleftherianos, Khilji, Lewis, McHugh, and Vonortas.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:17p.m. Provost Blake noted that the President is traveling on university business today; Provost Blake will chair today's meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the January 10, 2020, Faculty Senate meeting were approved unanimously without comment.

REPORTS: Chairs of the Strategic Planning Committees

High-Impact Research/Chair Alan Greenberg and Vice Chair Diana Burley:

Vice Chair Diana Burley emphasized the points made in the committee's interim report. She noted that the committee firmly believes that the foundation of the recommendations set out in the report are the Senate Research Committee's research ecosystem recommendations; these are primary and foundational and provide an opportunity for the university to move forward into the aspirational recommendations of the strategic plan. The report heavily emphasizes academic involvement across all of its recommendations; the committee firmly believes that there must be a coupling between the operational and academic aspects of the research enterprise.

Professor Burley noted that there is consistency throughout the report, reflecting the uniform messaging from the university community. She noted that the committee had no areas of significant debate regarding its recommendations. At the President's request, the committee attempted to assign some sense of priority to its recommendations with an eye toward the different resource levels required to implement these priorities. She noted that the President had asked, when the report was

presented to the Strategic Planning Task Force (SPTF), how implementation of the committee's recommendations should be staggered with those of the research ecosystem project. Dr. Burley noted that the committee does not have a good sense for how the research ecosystem recommendations are being addressed but that the committee has tried to provide a diverse portfolio of strategic planning recommendations. Some of these will require interaction with the research ecosystem project, and others will not.

Professor Greenberg noted that the committee's report is dense and includes input and feedback from hundreds of faculty, staff, and students. The committee hopes that the report will serve as a menu of options that can be selected from, depending on available resources and decisions around priorities.

Professor Subiaul asked how the Corcoran factors into the committee's recommendations. Professor Burley responded that the committee's report does not address the Corcoran or any other specific unit of the university, as it was written to be broader than any single entity by focusing on the breadth of different types of research done at GW. The result is a broad definition of high-impact research and a broad portfolio of metrics for measuring high-impact research. The committee will make adjustments as needed in its final report, which will incorporate this type of feedback. Professor Greenberg reiterated that this is an interim report, and the committee welcomes additional feedback as it continues its work.

Professor Wilson asked what efforts would be made to engage faculty working in areas other than medicine and engineering. Professor Burley responded that the report highlights research across the institution, including disciplines beyond medicine and engineering. She pointed out that, in discussions around infrastructure required to conduct research, there is likely a heavier focus on these two areas due to their unique requirements for space and equipment. The presentation of these examples should not be taken as an emphasis at the expense of other disciplines. She welcomed feedback on other types of infrastructure and resources that require the committee's attention.

World-Class Faculty/Professor Jim Wade

Dr. Kieff was unable to attend today's meeting, and Professor Jim Wade, a member of the committee, represented the committee for this update. Professor Wade noted that the committee was charged with developing a framework for the strategic plan that would then allow schools and units to develop their own plans with more explicit detail for implementation. The committee realized early on that there are sizable differences among the schools, and plans will be implemented very differently as a result. He noted that the committee's charge was to develop a strategy to recruit, retain, and promote an intellectually vibrant faculty that leverages GW's history, location, and opportunities. The goals developed involve 1) strengthening GW's tenure and tenure-track faculty (who are the intellectual and educational backbone of any world-class institution) and 2) leveraging GW's location to build programs to recruit renowned teaching, research, clinical, and practice faculty. Professor Wade emphasized that different schools would implement these recommendations in different ways.

Proposed initiatives include creating a center for faculty excellence, which would expand Faculty Affairs and provide resources to enhance recruitment, retention, and promotion of faculty; developing a university-wide high-impact hiring plan focused on diversity; recognizing and celebrating GW faculty to positively impact retention and the university culture; and launching a

mentoring program for all faculty with special emphasis on new faculty and on associate professors seeking promotion to the full professor level. In addition, the committee proposes initiating programs to attract high-impact DC professionals to the faculty (both full- and part-time) to enhance the curriculum. “Distinguished Visiting” faculty would be reserved for instructors with national or international reputations as leaders in educational innovation and pedagogy. The committee also recommends introducing a “Distinguished Professor of Practice,” which would be reserved for practitioners demonstrating sustained professional eminence and accomplishment in their fields.

Professor Roddis noted that the American Association for University Professors lists as a best practice for department chairs the recruitment, retention, and development of faculty; chairs are responsible for providing development opportunities for faculty. Chairs at GW are not receiving sufficient training and support in using mentoring. The university also has an annual review process for faculty (via Lyterati) that many of the schools use to set goals; this includes a feedback mechanism so that faculty are given an opportunity to describe what they are doing to contribute within the teaching, scholarship, and service arenas and supervisors are given an opportunity to respond in turn. This process is designed to provide a lot of mentoring to faculty, but it is not uniformly implemented across the schools; in addition, there are no consequences for supervisors for not participating in the process in a timely and useful fashion. She suggested that it would be better to support, enforce, and implement existing policies in this area rather than establishing a new mechanism. Professor Wade responded that schools doing this well can continue to work under their existing processes; those not doing so will work with the recommendations here to improve. Professor Roddis noted that Lyterati is a university-wide system that was designed for university-wide faculty review; the committee’s report doesn’t seem to take this system into account. Professor Wade responded that the committee is aware of Lyterati but that mentorship is more than entering data into the system; rather, it needs to be a broader part of the faculty culture at GW rather than simply legislated. Professor Roddis agreed with this point but noted that the university can make sure that a minimum level of mentorship is being met; to this end, any new goals should tie in to existing systems. Professor Wade responded that this recommendation would be further developed, noting that the intention is not to dictate exactly what the schools should do in this area but rather to develop a culture and systems that support mentorship, leaving the specifics of implementation up to the individual schools. Provost Blake noted that these concerns would be included when discussing implementation of these initiatives.

Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education/Chair Carol Sigelman

Professor Sigelman’s committee was given a fairly focused charge to elevate approximately ten doctoral programs and to look after the review and quality maintenance of all GW’s graduate programs. With one exception, Professor Sigelman noted, the committee held to this charge. She noted that the committee kept its focus on quality throughout its work. She stated that the charge as written suggested focusing on doctoral and master’s programs separately; the committee did not do this, considering graduate education as a whole. The committee also worked on defining quality, determining that separate sets of criteria were not required for different types of graduate programs; faculty on the committee working in a wide variety of areas saw the applicability of the criteria the committee proposed to their types of programs.

The committee did not receive much feedback on the set of criteria it developed; Professor Sigelman hoped that there would be more response on this, as the committee wants these criteria to be useful to a wide variety of programs with the idea that programs would emphasize different

specific metrics or indicators of each criterion based on the type of program (e.g., research vs. professional practice). The committee would like to see the criteria it developed used in a process to determine which doctoral programs are selected for special focus as well as in a self-evaluation and feedback process involving all doctoral programs. In addition, the committee would like to see the criteria used in departments' Academic Program Reviews (APR) and, recalling Professor Roddis's earlier remarks, have the APR process done regularly and consistently. The criteria can also be used in the development and vetting of new program proposals.

The committee recommends the creation of a Vice Provost for Graduate Studies (or similar title). This role would be a university-level advocate and catalyst for support for graduate education and graduate students. GW does not currently have such a position as part of its administrative structure; its peer institutions do. Many tasks could be accomplished through this administrator, including stronger development of interdisciplinary programs, a coordinated focus with the schools on policy and financial issues unique to graduate education, and the improvement of data available for APRs. The committee would also like to see an increased capability for market research to aid in the development of programs that are responsive to needs in the field and improve career advising.

Professor Gupta expressed a concern about the doctoral programs that aren't identified as the ten preeminent programs. He noted that the committee's report answers some of his worries in this area, but he asked for a public assurance that other programs won't be killed as a result of this initiative. Professor Sigelman stated that the other programs will not be killed as a result of the plan to elevate ten programs to preeminence. She noted that the committee wants to see all doctoral programs aspiring to be better all the time, adding that the criteria developed by the committee will give direction to all programs in this vein. She noted that it would be a huge mistake to try to reduce the number of doctoral programs at GW to ten; this would not be a route toward becoming a comprehensive global research university. She added that this committee will not be choosing the doctoral programs designated for elevation; this process will be worked out with the schools and will include faculty involvement.

Professor Roddis noted that a similar "preeminent program" plan was implemented previously at GW and wondered whether a post-mortem might be done to determine the results of that investment and whether it is worth doing again. Professor Sigelman responded that she did not know whether a final evaluation of the earlier Selective Excellence program was conducted, adding that some beneficiaries of that program are thriving currently, possibly with help from that investment. She noted that evaluations of the proposed initiatives are called for in the committee's report.

Professor Roddis asked about the PhD program support packages, specifically tuition; she referenced the announcement last month that research-supported graduate students would no longer receive a tuition match. To the best of her knowledge, this was announced without consultation with the faculty, deans, or the Vice President for Research. This change has a massive impact on the schools and seems to be going in the opposite direction of what this committee is proposing. Provost Blake responded that these funds were moved from the central administration to the schools without instruction for their use. Deputy Provost Murphy added that the tuition match program is not being ended; rather, responsibility for the program is being moved to the individual schools. The program can be continued at the deans' discretion. She understood the confusion around the matter and recommended that faculty speak with their deans for clarification of how a specific school will be proceeding. Professor Roddis noted that the slow response to her expressed

concern about this issue is disheartening, adding that many research-active faculty are demoralized by this apparent elimination of support. Deputy Provost Murphy took this concern under advisement and noted that it will be discussed in the Provost's office. Professor Sigelman added that the committee was also not aware that this change was coming; this issue highlights the importance of an item in the committee's report about the need to discuss and explicitly work out a sound plan regarding centralization and decentralization in graduate education. Provost Blake noted that his further remarks on this are part of his planned Provost remarks later in the meeting.

Professor Tekleselassie noted that the proposed Vice Provost for Graduate Studies position could indeed provide the special focus that graduate students need, but it could also add another layer of bureaucracy that might hinder progress when resources used for the position might be better invested in the existing structures. He asked what best practices led to this recommendation. Professor Sigelman responded that, while most issues around graduate education can and should be managed in the schools, some issues around graduate education need overarching central care or apply across schools (e.g., health care subsidies, developing mechanisms to support funding issues related to interdisciplinary programs). The committee envisions the Vice Provost working with the schools collaboratively for continuous improvement in graduate education.

Professor Orti asked to what extent this committee was consulted around the re-budgeting of graduate tuition funding; Professor Sigelman responded that it was not consulted.

Professor Mylonas asked whether the proposed Vice Provost position would be responsible for distributing funds or would be a solely coordinating role. Professor Sigelman responded that some funding was left centrally for initiatives such as diversity fellowships but that most would be managed by the schools. In addition, there are central offices that look after graduate enrollment management and fellowships; these efforts would be part of a revitalized focus on graduate education.

High-Quality Undergraduate Education/Chair Gayle Wald and Vice Chair Jason Zara

Professor Wald noted that the committee's interim report reflects a strong sense of consensus among the committee members. The report is a true draft, with broad general agreement and a number of ongoing conversations around the edges as the committee continues to consider questions and think through the metrics for its recommendations. She noted that many of the committee's recommendations build on things that are already happening at GW. The compressed timeline for the interim report meant that the committee has not yet compiled an appendix of examples of where many of its recommendations have already been implemented (including but not limited to information on experiential service learning opportunities, data science minors, and career services work around competencies employers and students are seeking).

Currently, the committee is carefully sorting through feedback from a variety of sources, including the strategic planning website, interviews with stakeholders, reporting in *The Hatchet*, and the recent town hall. Professor Wald noted that a student focus group will take place on February 19. The committee invited over 150 students (random invitations were designed to capture a diversity of attendants); thus far, 23 students have committed to attend. She noted that many students have RSVP'd with regrets due to their dynamic lives as students. One student was unable to attend due to their being out of the country working with the United Nations; this says something very good about the state of undergraduate education at GW already.

Professor Wald noted that the big issues the committee is hearing about center on the inclusion of and support of the humanities and funding for the strategic plan's initiatives. The committee shares the concern around funding, understanding that many recommendations (examples include bringing the advisor-to-student ratio into parity and compliance and elevating and enhancing service learning opportunities) will require significant investment.

With regard to the humanities, Professor Wald noted that the committee addressed the strategic planning process from a holistic viewpoint as opposed to thinking about the zero-sum game of elevating one area at the expense of another. In this sense, the committee's view was to build on existing strengths. The committee sees the 30% STEM goal as a single metric among many, and it was not treated as a defining way of thinking about undergraduate education. The committee approached these questions through the lens of what GW students need today to be equipped. The committee feels very firmly about the value of a strong liberal arts education, including for those students in the professional schools, approaching the idea of quantitative and technological competencies as something all graduating students need today. In the same vein, STEM students need communication, empathy, and critical thinking skills. Professor Wald emphasized that the committee has worked to refrain from being prescriptive in its recommendations. She noted that with the broadened definition of STEM now used in higher education, GW stands at around 24% STEM and expressed the committee's belief that 30% STEM is likely something that will happen regardless of university interventions toward increasing STEM; in this sense, growth in STEM at GW can be set aside as the main focus of the committee's report.

Professor Wilson appreciated the report's recommendation on pop-up courses as a very good way to pilot potential 3-credit courses and facilitate interdisciplinary work. He asked what the impediments are to this type of coursework. Professor Zara responded that he was recently part of such a course that brought together engineering, anthropology, and business to focus on human-centered design. When it was brought to him, Professor Zara expressed skepticism that the course could work, but he reported that the course has been hugely popular and has engaged students in the community. Students will be drawn to great ideas to learn. He suggested that the impediment to this kind of creative course design is faculty members' perceptions of what students really want. Professor Wilson observed that, for a different administrator than Professor Zara, such initial skepticism might mean that the course would not be approved to go forward. Professor Wald agreed, adding that part of what will allow innovative courses like these to launch will be shifts in the bureaucracy (e.g., how to make it possible for a student to take a zero-credit course in GW's system). The committee's report strove to imagine the horizons of what can be accomplished if the system is not a barrier.

Professor Wirtz applauded the committee's work and asked whether the committee took any formal position on the impact the 20% reduction in the undergraduate student body will have on the discount rate and what the well-documented results in terms of quality of education through ACRK, diversity, and graduation rate mean for the long-term future of undergraduate education at GW. Professor Wald responded that the committee has not taken a formal position on this, as early on in the process the President took this in some ways off of the committee's charge; the committee was not formally charged with figuring out this impact. Professor Wirtz asked why, given the importance of this impact on the quality of the undergraduate experience, this would have been removed from the committee's charge. Professor Zara noted that the charge was presented under the assumption of the 20% reduction. Consideration of how the university might value diversity, financial aid, and student quality remained part of the committee's charge, and the committee has taken a clear

position in support of all of these measures and of working toward meeting 100% of student financial need. Professor Wirtz suggested that consideration of the impact of this reduction is key in considering what recommendations should be made in the strategic planning process. Provost Blake noted that the reports were meant to be strategically visionary and the desire was to have the committees spend their time working in this vein rather than on implementation details. Professor Wald added that the committee did meet with the Director of Admissions, who shared data that she believes the President has also shared with the Senate. The committee's statement on its values around student quality, diversity, and financial aid are written into its report, even though the committee is not empowered to make these decisions. Professor Wirtz noted that there should be a place at the university where constructive discussion can be had with regard to what the inevitable impact will be of a 20% reduction in the student body. He wondered where, if not in this committee, this consideration should be taking place. The Provost responded that the implementation task force is the appropriate body for this work. Professor Wirtz asked if this task force will report to the Senate. Provost Blake responded that the task force is currently partnering with the strategic planning committees and will work with faculty, including the Senate, as it continues its work. Professor Wirtz noted that he can think of no issue that is of more importance to the future of GW than the impact of the 20% reduction on the quality, diversity, and graduation rate of its undergraduates. He requested that the Senate be actively engaged in these deliberations one way or the other. Provost Blake committed to this involvement.

Professor Swaine noted that a number of these reports turn on some key terms that are hard to define (e.g., high-impact research). In the current report, he noted a commitment to the concept of "interdisciplinary" or "cross-disciplinary" work. In today's discussion, the emphasis was more on "liberal arts education," and he wondered if the committee understood these to be the same thing or, rather, a mandate to turn toward courses involving multiple disciplines as opposed to a broad experience of courses in different disciplines. Professor Zara responded that the committee thinks about these as not equivalent but both valuable. He noted that the multidisciplinary coursework being contemplated here doesn't involve "trade-off teaching" (with rotating faculty members leading course meetings) but rather crafting new materials together in areas such as energy or climate change, bringing the strengths of the university together not only to educate students but also to demonstrate to them how many fields can contribute to an area of interest. In addition, a breadth of study is important to give students a broad, educated perspective on the world. Professor Wald reiterated that "liberal arts" was used as a shorthand for considering the whole student in the context of professional study.

Professor Yezer asked whether the committee measured the fraction of undergraduate instruction that is done by adjunct faculty members. Professor Zara responded in the negative. Professor Yezer asked whether the committee believes that adjunct teaching, by faculty who don't hold office hours because they don't have offices on campus, is compatible with high quality education. Professor Zara noted that the university employs different adjuncts across campus with different roles, including those holding office hours in on-campus office space and that the broad assumption that adjuncts can't hold office hours is false. He noted that a generalized answer to Professor Yezer's question is not appropriate. Professor Yezer noted that there are major departments at GW in which half of the undergraduate teaching is done by adjunct faculty; this is harmful for student retention and should be addressed in the committee's report.

The Provost commended all the committees for their hard work in producing these interim reports. He noted that the first community forum for report feedback was held on February 10; two more

will be held on February 26 and March 4. These provide opportunities for feedback, as does the Strategic Planning website. Following this comment period, the committees will work to consider and incorporate all the feedback they receive and will write their final reports.

REPORT: Student Experience Organizational Initiatives and Updates (Cissy Petty, Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students)

Due to the length of the first agenda item, Dean Petty had to leave prior to making her presentation, which will be rescheduled.

REPORT: Special Committee synthesizing the strategic planning reports (Sarah Wagner, Special Committee Chair)

Professor Marotta-Walters introduced the Special Committee's report, thanking the committee for its hard work synthesizing a great deal of information. The Senate will have an opportunity to debate and discuss the report. Following this discussion, Professor Marotta-Walters will request the Senate's unanimous consent to send this report to the Special Faculty Assembly on February 25.

Professor Wagner reviewed the attached slides, which summarize the points made in the October Faculty Assembly petition, the actions taken in response to the petition, and the committee's summary of findings organized by petition question. She noted that the committee did its best to present a factual account of the landscape of response, deliberation, and action on behalf of the Senate and its committees. The report and all its appendices are also attached to these minutes.

Professor Yezer noted that, due to Professor Cordes's current unavailability, the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting committee may not have a full response ready by the Special Assembly. He noted that the university's current financial situation, given its debt, requires that it run an operating surplus. Given the implications of this plan, he expressed his opinion that the university would violate its responsibility to its creditors. He therefore regards the plan as aspirational. Professor Wagner acknowledged this but noted that it is already being implemented. Issues such as the one around the budgeting of graduate tuition match funds and the lack of involvement from the graduate education strategic planning committee in this issue illustrate the need—requested by the petition—for strong principles of shared governance at every level of the process.

Professor Rao thanked Professor Wagner and the committee for its hard work. He noted that the report's intent might be perceived as two-fold: to critique the process or lack thereof leading to this point or to put roadblocks in place to current plan. He asked what the goal of the report is, noting that a case can be made (acknowledging that the administration's plan is not perfect) that it is reasonable to move forward and also that it is reasonable to criticize university leadership on some of the governance issues and how the plan was rolled out initially. He asked how the committee proposes the university move forward from this point. Professor Wagner responded that the report is the committee's attempt to take stock of the Senate's (including the Senate committees named in the report) and the administration's responses to the petition. She highlighted President LeBlanc's response to petition point #3, quoting from his response: "there was no specific report, consultant, singular data point, or recommendation that led the board, with my concurrence, to the decision to reduce the undergraduate, residential headcount and increase the fraction of STEM majors." She noted that she finds it highly problematic that no specific data could be presented that led to the

decision to reduce the undergraduate headcount by 20% as opposed to another number; there is no understanding of how this process has been informed.

Professor Mylonas noted that, based on the discussion, some decisions appear to have already been made by the administration in anticipation of future shifts following the implementation of the strategic plan. These choices seem to have already been made without waiting for any advice from the Senate, the committees, or any other group. He perceived a logical fallacy related to the required timing of decisions by the faculty assembly and the fact that parts of the university already need to respond in anticipation of the implementation of the strategic plan.

Professor Wirtz noted that there is always the possibility that there was some underlying motivation that hasn't come out that, if it had, would have led the university to this path. However, he noted he is less concerned about motivation or the facts leading to the decision to make the 20% reduction. He expressed his primary concern over the fact that a number of faculty have run numerous models to understand the impact of the 20/30 plan on factors such as student quality, diversity, and graduation rate. In all of these models, at least one of these measures suffers as a result of the reduction. Because of this, the faculty have approached the administration asking to be shown where their models are wrong so that the university doesn't have to wait for a bad outcome but can instead anticipate an outcome and plan for it. These inquiries have received no response, and the administration seems unwilling to engage in this discussion. Professor Wagner noted that she doesn't believe these two elements—motivation and facts behind the plan as well as open analysis of the plan's likely outcomes—are antithetical; both things should have occurred much earlier in the current process.

Professor Johnson recalled President LeBlanc's December presentation to the Senate, noting he believes the President has looked at the many moving parts in a complicated plan, has made it clear that changes would be made incrementally, and has indicated that the plan would be revisited and revised as needed based on reviews of each incremental change. He stated his confidence that the administration is making a wise decision and that the faculty has now received a tremendous amount of information and has had many opportunities to advise and consent. He expressed his belief that not admitting the lowest quality 20% of currently admitted students going forward would greatly improve the quality of the undergraduate student body. Professor Wagner responded that, while she appreciated Professor Johnson's comment, it serves to expose the fact that there is not full understanding among the faculty regarding how the 20% reduction will be applied. In fact, it is not a matter of simply "lopping off" the bottom 20% of students (with regard to academic quality), leaving only the stronger students.

Professor Gutman noted that the request for data around the culture initiative was denied because of confidentiality issues; this is something that can't be provided without violating that requirement. Professor Wagner responded that, while she understood that the financial details were bound by confidentiality, she was surprised the Disney Institute wouldn't be able to respond to an inquiry for information about how they design and validate their survey instruments, noting that GW has many faculty members who are more than qualified to perform this work in-house.

Professor Gutman added that the Assembly petition called for information behind the 20/30 plan, which has largely been received; the response today seems to suggest that the committee believes there is more information that hasn't been provided. Professor Wagner responded that the concern is around the lack of data and external consultations supporting the arrival at the 20% figure,

specifically. She noted that the committee has worked to be good researchers in this matter and to look carefully at the data that has been provided. Professor Gutman summarized the committee's position by noting that the fact that so many are astonished by the responses received suggests that the information provided doesn't support conclusions the administration has drawn around this plan. Professor Wagner agreed, adding that the committee's charge was not to tell the Senate what to do with this assessment.

Professor Zara noted that much of the present discussion isn't about current report but rather about next steps, whether that be a resolution or something else; the current report is a finding of fact. He commended Professor Wagner for her hard work on the special committee.

Professor Marotta-Walters noted that, with regard to the questions on the culture initiative, GW is under a contractual obligation not to reveal the Disney Institute contract cost because of differing levels of contract costs the Institute establishes with other types of institutions; each contract they write is tailored to the size and resources of the individual organization. She noted that the selection of the Disney Institute was the result of a bidding process tied to the university's budget line for external services, adding that the culture initiative represented a significant part of what President LeBlanc was hired to do at the university.

She then recalled Professor Wagner's quote from President LeBlanc's response letter regarding a lack of a singular data point leading to the 20/30 decision. She noted that the decision is based on the weight of all the evidence and that she interpreted this specific response as meaning it took two years of weeding through a great deal of material (as opposed to basing the decision on one data point) for the Board to reach the 20/30 plan decision. She added that, once the Board made this decision, Moody's endorsed it as a wise move for a university with GW's aspirations. With that done, the implementation task force is now intricately involved in planning models around whether this plan continues over five years or is revised at years two or three.

Professor Yezer noted that he teaches a large section of 250 first-year students each fall and that there are some weak students in that group. He suggested that it's possible these weaker students are paying the most for their education, while those students pointing out errors in his slides are receiving the larger financial aid packages to attend GW. He noted that there is price discrimination that happens at GW and that faculty are being compensated for working with students who struggle; he wants to help all his students succeed, not just the very strongest.

Professor Sidawy suggested that perhaps the 20% reduction level came from the fact that this is the reduction that would be required to arrive at the 30% STEM goal, given where GW began in terms of its STEM levels. Professor Perry recalled hearing that GW was at 16% STEM—second from the bottom among its peer institutions—prior to the Science and Engineering Hall coming online; this percentage increased following the opening of the Science and Engineering Hall. Professor Sidawy recalled seeing data that GW's initially low STEM level was boosted with the adoption of the Department of Homeland Security definition of STEM. He suggested that the target reduction of 20% was established in order to reach 30% STEM among the newly resized student body. Professor Wirtz noted that there has never, to his knowledge, been any linkage between the 20% reduction in the undergraduate residential headcount and the 30% STEM target, which represent two separate endeavors. He suggested that the 20% reduction plan came from projections indicating a significant drop in the college-bound population around 2027 and the university's desire to prepare for this.

Provost Blake confirmed that there is no link between the undergraduate reduction target and the STEM increase.

Professor Johnson noted that GW is proposing an experiment based on the hypothesis that the reduction of the undergraduate student body will improve the quality of the student body. This hypothesis will be proven or not, but it will be done incrementally and will be adjusted accordingly.

Professor Wagner noted that the special committee can say, as a result of its work, that the process around the 20/30 plan has not been well understood. She added that she, as a Director of Graduate Studies, can't put faith in a process that hasn't been built on strong evidence.

Professor Marotta-Walters requested and obtained the Senate's unanimous consent to place this report on the agenda of the Special Assembly on February 25.

RESOLUTION 20/9: On Shared Governance (Ioannis Eleftherianos, Guillermo Orti, and Daniel Schwartz, Resolution Co-Authors)

Professor Marotta-Walters brought Resolution 20/9 back to the Senate, following the work done on the resolution at the January Senate meeting (where the resolving clauses were edited) and by the special drafting committee appointed at that meeting (this committee edited the whereas clauses of the resolution). She noted that the current resolution incorporates all of these changes.

Professor Johnson moved to close debate on the resolution and move it to a vote. The motion was seconded and failed to achieve the required two-thirds vote.

Professor Wagner asked whether someone from the drafting committee could describe the work done on the whereas clauses. Professor Swaine responded that the effort of the drafting committee was to clarify and reduce some of the resolution's language while keeping the spirit of the original resolution, which was developed outside the usual Senate committee process. Professor Marotta-Walters added that the resolution's content was synthesized down to fewer whereas clauses and confirmed that no content changes were made.

Professor Mylonas expressed a concern that Resolving Clause 5 might be contradicted by what is already occurring with regard to the 20% reduction. Provost Blake responded that this clause is in alignment with what's being done now. Professor Yezer noted that the key language in this clause is the "further" implementation of the plan.

No further debate occurred, and the resolution passed without opposition by voice vote.

RESOLUTION 20/10: To Amend the Appropriate Regulation of Honors, Awards, or Distinctions by Units of the University (Scheherazade Rehman, Chair, Honors & Academic Convocations Committee)

Professor Marotta-Walters introduced the resolution, which clarifies the Senate Honors and Academic Convocations committee's ability to make clearer the criteria for awarding honors. The current resolution clarifies language initially adopted by Senate Resolution 04/09. The revised language makes it easier for the committee to conduct its business of selecting and approving individuals nominated for University honors.

Professor Wirtz offered an amendment to strike “the Honors and Convocations Committee recommends that” from the first line of the resolution; the amendment was accepted by Professor Marotta-Walters and agreed to without objection.

The resolution passed without opposition by voice vote.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

Professor Holly Dugan offered the attached Resolution on Diversity on behalf of the Libraries Committee; the resolution was referred to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for assignment.

GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Nominations for election of new members to Senate standing committees
 - None
- II. Election of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Nominating Committee

Professor Marotta-Walters requested and obtained unanimous consent for the attached slate.
- III. Reports of the Standing Committees
 - None
- IV. Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Sylvia Marotta-Walters, Chair
 - Professor Marotta-Walters read a portion of the attached Executive Committee report into the record.
- V. Provost’s Remarks
 - Applications are very close to last year’s numbers, and the class looks very robust. While there has been an increase in domestic applications, international applications are down (predominantly due to a decrease in applications from China). The applicant pool is more diverse across the board. The university purchased additional names for marketing purposes this year, which has helped the university maintain its application levels in a year when many of GW’s peer institutions have seen a decrease in applications.
 - The Provost is chairing a future enrollment task force, which is something of a subcommittee to the High-Quality Undergraduate Education strategic planning committee. The group will work with numbers and scenarios to make recommendations and will not be a decision making body. The task force consists of deans, faculty, enrollment staff, and a student representative. In order to frame ideas around how the university might look at programs on an individual basis, the task force will work with the Undergraduate Education strategic planning committee to develop overarching themes such as the interpretation of unstructured data (which spans the humanities).

- The funding shift around graduate fellowships (moving the budget authority from the central administration to the schools), is designed to give more direct control over this funding to the schools. The university budget model shouldn't tax schools before they had a chance to do their discounting; the new calculation taxes schools net of discounting, giving the schools more revenue and an incentive to do more discounting at the school level. The administration determined which fellowships and scholarships are intrinsically central (~\$5.5 million) and will be retained centrally; another ~\$7 million was moved to the schools, eliminating the central administration as a flow-through for these funds. The move is cost-neutral, and schools will be held harmless this year. This change will allow schools to be more academically entrepreneurial.
- An announcement regarding the new Law School Dean is expected in the coming week.
- GW's current academic merit policy at GW is a 10-semester guarantee. Under this policy, there is not a commensurate level of quality, as students can retain academic merit unless they are on academic probation or are suspended (the threshold stands at a 2.0 GPA currently). The Provost is discussing this threshold with the deans and will develop a recommendation about where the academic merit line should be drawn. Any change would not affect students currently enrolled and would apply to new students going forward. Very few students covered under the academic merit policy are in 2.0-3.0 GPA range. The Provost anticipates smoothing a change over a few years, beginning with a 2.7 GPA threshold. He invited feedback from the Senate on this issue.

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Regarding the graduate fellowships budget authority change, Professor Yezer congratulated the Provost on the administration's decision not to levy a tax on the schools for revenue that they never receive.

Professor Roddis questioned the university's decision—announced this week—to move from the Google platform to Microsoft 365 for email and calendaring. She noted that the stated reason for doing so is the same reason that was provided for using the Google system. She noted that many staff are extremely dissatisfied with this decision, and, given that the culture initiative places great weight on collaboration in decision making, she asked how this decision was made. Professor Zara noted that the Educational Policy and Technology committee has invited the Chief Financial Officer to visit the committee and discuss changes in technology at GW.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37pm.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON MATTERS INCLUDED IN THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY PETITION

FEBRUARY 14, 2020

THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, DC

1

OCTOBER 22, 2019 FACULTY ASSEMBLY PETITION

Item #1: whether the strategic plan followed principles of shared governance

Item #2: the costs and methodology of the Cultural Initiative

Item #3: on the data supporting the 20/30 plan

Item #4: on amending the charges of the strategic planning committees

Item #5: on the strategic planning timeline and consultation with faculty

Item #6: charge to convene a Special Assembly

2

DATA COMPILED

- ▶ Responses of the five Faculty Senate Committees (Appointments, Salaries and Promotion Policies; Research; Education and Technology Policy; Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom; and Fiscal Planning and Budgeting)
- ▶ Senate resolutions and reports (ASPP Report to the Senate; Resolution 20/7 from EP&T; Resolution 20/8 from Research Committee; Resolution 20/9 on Shared Governance)
- ▶ President LeBlanc's December 13, 2019 report to the Senate and his responses to two letters from the Special Committee regarding petition items #2 and 3

3

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Item #1 (on shared governance):

Several committees determined that the strategic plan did not properly follow the principles of shared governance.

The Senate itself will vote on this question today when it considers the revised Resolution 20/9.

4

Item #2 (on the costs and methodology of the Cultural Initiative):

No specific data regarding the cost of the initiative, the Disney Institute consultation, or the cultural survey design and analysis were provided to the Special Committee, the Senate, or the petitioning Faculty as a whole.

5

Item #3 (on data supporting the 20/30 plan):

The Senate and its five committees received fragmentary and incomplete information that does not logically support the 20/30 plan.

Several attempts to collect specific data (e.g. Resolution 20/7, item #3, questions a. through h. and the Special Committee's January 17, 2020 letter to President LeBlanc) did not produce the specific information requested.

6

Item #4 (on amending the charges of the strategic planning committees):

The Research Committee supported changing the charges of the strategic planning committees.

Other committees provided comments regarding ideal STEM ratios, student body size, undergraduate enrollment, and team-based research.

President LeBlanc did not provide specific data regarding impact of the 20/30 plan on the curricular, research, and diversity and inclusion missions of the University.

The Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee indicated that it intends to address the financial implications of enrollment reductions in time for the February 25, 2020 Special Assembly.

7

Item #5 (on the strategic planning timeline and consultation with faculty):

The Senate and its five committees requested that they have the opportunity to review and respond to the strategic planning documents before submission to President LeBlanc and the Board of Trustees.

The original strategic planning timetable did not allow for that consultation; the subsequently adjusted timetable now permits such consultation to take place.

8

Item #6 (Special Assembly):

The Special Assembly has been scheduled for February 25, 2020, one month later than the date requested in the petition.

The Senate set this date so that the Assembly could respond to the strategic planning reports.

9

CONCLUSIONS

The Faculty Assembly Petition posed five sets of issues. Three and a half months later, the Special Committee finds that the Senate, through its five committees, and President LeBlanc have addressed them partially, though not completely.

We submit this report to the full Faculty for its consideration during the Special Assembly to be held on February 25, 2020.

10

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON MATTERS INCLUDED IN THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY PETITION February 5, 2020

In Resolution 20/6, passed on December 13, 2019, the Faculty Senate established the Special Committee on Matters included in the Faculty Assembly Petition of October 22, 2019. This report presents the Special Committee's compilation of responses from the five Senate committees charged with addressing petition items #1-5 (i.e., the Research Committee; Education Policy and Technology Committee; Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee; Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee; and the Appointments, Salaries and Promotion Policies Committee). The Special Committee also sought information from President LeBlanc related to petition items #2 and 3.

We summarize here the information gathered. All supporting documentation is found in the attached Appendix.

Item #1 (on shared governance): Several committees determined that the strategic plan did not properly follow the principles of shared governance. The Senate itself will vote on this question when it considers the revised Resolution 20/9 on February 14, 2020.

Item #2 (on the costs and methodology of the Cultural Initiative): Despite the petition's request for information about the Cultural Initiative and the Special Committee's January 27, 2020 letter to President LeBlanc reposing this request, no specific data regarding the cost of the initiative, the Disney Institute consultation, or the cultural survey design and analysis were provided to the Special Committee, the Senate, or the petitioning Faculty as a whole.

Item #3 (on data supporting the 20/30 plan): The Senate and its five committees received fragmentary and incomplete information that does not logically support the 20/30 plan. Several attempts to collect specific data (e.g. Resolution 20/7, item #3, questions a. through h. and the Special Committee's January 17, 2020 letter to President LeBlanc) did not produce the specific information requested.

Item #4 (on amending the charges of the strategic planning committees): Only the Research Committee supported changing the charges of the strategic planning committees to release constraints on their research endeavors. Other committees provided comments regarding ideal STEM ratios, student body size, undergraduate enrollment, and team-based research. In his response to the Special Committee's January 17, 2020 letter, President LeBlanc did not provide specific data regarding impact of the 20/30 plan on the curricular, research, and diversity and inclusion missions of the University. The Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee indicated that it intends to address the financial implications of enrollment reductions in time for the February 25, 2020 Special Assembly.

Item #5 (on the strategic planning timeline and consultation with faculty): The Senate and its five committees requested that they have the opportunity to review and respond to the strategic planning documents before submission to President LeBlanc and the Board of Trustees. The original strategic

planning timetable did not allow for that consultation; the subsequently adjusted timetable now permits such consultation to take place.

Item #6: The Special Assembly has been scheduled for February 25, 2020, one month later than the date requested in the petition. The Senate set this date so that the Assembly could respond to the strategic planning reports.

I. THE SENATE COMMITTEES' RESPONSES:

Appointments, Salaries and Promotion Policies Committee

The ASPP Committee responded to each of the five items in their November 22, 2019 report presented to the Faculty Senate, which was included in the December 13, 2019 Senate Agenda. (See attached; ASPP's responses are also compiled in the attached "Table 1: ASPP Committee Response.")

Research Committee

The Research Committee responded to each of the five items, finding items #2 (part B) and 5 directly in their purview. It also submitted Resolution 20/8 ("On Involvement of Faculty and Its Elected Representatives in Shaping Strategic Planning") to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on November 1, 2019. The resolution was approved by the Senate in vote on December 13, 2019. (See attached "Table 2: Research Committee Response"; and Resolution 20/8.)

Education Policy and Technology Committee

The Education Policy and Technology Committee responded to four of the five items, finding items #2, 3, and 5 directly in their purview. It also submitted Resolution 20/7 ("On Involvement of Faculty and Its Elected Representatives in Shaping Strategic Planning") to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on November 6, 2019. The resolution was approved by the Senate in vote on December 13, 2019. (See attached "Table 3: EP&T Committee Response"; and Resolution 20/7.)

Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

The Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee responded to each of the five items. While they found that none of the items fell within their direct purview, in response to items #1 and 5, the committee affirmed that shared governance is "an issue of concern." (See attached "Table 4: PEAFC Committee Response.")

Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee

The Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee discussed the five items and responded specifically to impacts of the undergraduate enrollment reductions (relating to petition items #3, 4, and 5). The committee anticipates having preliminary estimates of the budget impact of the enrollment cuts in time for the February 25, 2020 Special Assembly. (See attached "Table 5: FP&B Committee Response.")

II. SHARED GOVERNANCE

In response to petition item #1 regarding the “principles of shared governance,” Resolution 20/9 (“On Shared Governance”) was included on the December 13, 2019 Senate agenda, debated during the January 10, 2019 Senate meeting, sent to an ad hoc committee for revision, and will be reconsidered during the February 14, 2020 Senate meeting. (See the attached version to be considered on February 14, 2020.)

III. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SOUGHT FROM PRESIDENT LEBLANC

On January 17, 2020, the Special Committee sent a letter to President LeBlanc following up on his December 13, 2019 report to the Senate. Specifically, the committee sought clarification and additional information pertaining to questions a. through h. of Resolution 20/7. (See attached.)

On January 27, 2020, the Special Committee sent a letter to President LeBlanc requesting he respond to the questions posed in petition item #2. (See attached.)

President LeBlanc sent two letters to the Special Committee on February 4, 2020, in response to its January 17 and January 20 inquiries. (See attached.)

IV. CONCLUSION

The Faculty Assembly Petition posed five sets of issues. Three and a half months later, the Special Committee finds that the Senate, through its five committees, and President LeBlanc have addressed them partially, though not completely.

The Special Committee hereby submits this report to the Faculty Senate for review during its February 14, 2020 meeting and to the full Faculty for its consideration during the Special Assembly to be held on February 25, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Wagner	Kausik Sarkar
Joseph Cordes	Daniel Schwartz
Guillermo Orti	Jason Zara

APPENDIX: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

1. Table 1: ASPP Committee Response
2. Table 2: Research Committee Response
3. Table 3: EP&T Committee Response
4. Table 4: PEAf Committee Response
5. Table 5: FP&B Committee Response
6. ASPP Committee Response to Faculty Assembly Petition
7. Resolution 20/7
8. Resolution 20/8
9. Resolution 20/9 (revised version for February 14, 2020 Senate meeting)
10. Special Committee Letter to President LeBlanc 1.17.20
11. Special Committee Letter to President LeBlanc 1.27.20
12. President LeBlanc's Response to Special Committee's 1.17.20 Letter (2.4.20)
13. President LeBlanc's response to Special Committee's 1.27.20 Letter (2.4.20)

Table 1: Appointment, Salaries and Promotion Policies Committee (ASPP) Responses to Assembly Petition

Question Posed to ASPP	Purview of ASPP	Response by ASPP
<p>Petition Item #1: “Did the adoption of the strategic plan of increasing the ratio of STEM majors and significantly decreasing undergraduate enrollment properly follow recognized principles of shared governance?”</p>	<p>Yes [see “ASPP Committee Response to Faculty Assembly Petition Points dated October 6, 2019”] Note: The committee’s response was dated November 22, 2019.</p>	<p>“GWU did not properly follow the principles of shared governance as the 20% decrease came down from the Board of Trustees.”</p> <p>[On page 1 of the “ASPP Committee Response to Faculty Assembly Petition Points dated October 6, 2019,” the committee stated: “GW faculty need a voice in the decisions being made as well as transparency in the process, as required by the Faculty Code. We also need to keep the needs of our students in mind and possibly add undergraduate programs in data management and data skills.”]</p>
<p>Petition Item #2: “What is the total cost (past and future) of the Culture Initiative?” Methodology and validation of survey instrument applied.</p>	<p>Yes [see “ASPP Committee Response to Faculty Assembly Petition Points dated October 6, 2019”]</p>	<p>“Not known. We do not have any of this information.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #3: A. “What data supported the decision to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and increase STEM majors by 50%?” Data on consultants (identities, costs, data provided).</p>	<p>Yes [see “ASPP Committee Response to Faculty Assembly Petition Points dated October 6, 2019”]</p>	<p>“We have no knowledge.”</p> <p>[On page 1 of the “ASPP Committee Response to Faculty Assembly Petition Points dated October 6, 2019,” the committee offered comments related to petition item #3: “GW needs to ensure that increase in STEM areas do not cause a decline in faculty appointments in humanities and other non-STEM areas. This concerns not only regular faculty hires but also part time and specialized faculty hires.” “While the number of undergraduates in five schools (CCAS, ESIA, GWSPH, SB, SEAS) increased by 1284 (13.81%) over 5 years between 2013 and 2018, the number of regular full-time faculty increased only by 15 (1.82%). When we increase enrollments in STEM areas, we must ensure that the numbers of tenured lines also increase commensurately.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #4: “should the charges of the each of the five strategic planning committees be</p>	<p>Yes [see “ASPP Committee Response to Faculty Assembly Petition Points dated October 6, 2019”]</p>	<p>ASPP did not directly answer whether charges to the committee should be amended, but offered the following comments: “1. Best size: We have no idea.</p>

<p>amended to address the best size and ideal STEM ratio for the undergraduate population?”</p>		<p>2. STEM ratio: This information is probably available somewhere but we don't know. 3. Impact: This needs to be determined. ASPP committee supports the mission of the university. 4. Team based research: The premise is unclear. What stops team-based research?”</p>
<p>Petition Item #5: “Should the four strategic planning committees appointed by the President report their findings to the Faculty for approval and /or amendment before these reports are sent to the Strategic Planning Task Force or the GWU administration?”</p>	<p>Yes [see “ASPP Committee Response to Faculty Assembly Petition Points dated October 6, 2019”]</p>	<p>“Yes. The timeline for the strategic planning committees is being modified currently.”</p>

Table 2: Faculty Senate Research Committee (FSRC) Responses to Assembly Petition

Question Posed to FSRC	Purview of FSRC	Response by FSRC
<p>Petition Item #1: “Did the adoption of the strategic plan of increasing the ratio of STEM majors and significantly decreasing undergraduate enrollment properly follow recognized principles of shared governance?”</p>	<p>“We suggest this is in the purview of another committee or the Senate as a whole.”</p>	<p>FSRC supports Resolution 20/9 which was on the Senate agenda for December 13 and is slated for a vote in the January Senate meeting.</p>
<p>Petition Item #2: “What is the total cost (past and future) of the Culture Initiative?” Methodology and validation of survey instrument applied.</p>	<p>“Part A (cost) belongs to another committee such as Fiscal Planning and Budgeting.” “Part B (methods). Please see response.”</p>	<p>“The Research Committee supports the convening of a faculty-led “Research Sub-committee on the Culture Initiative” to request and evaluate the current Culture Initiative survey and focus group questions, data, findings, and implementation. This sub-committee would present its findings to the FSRC.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #3: A. “What data supported the decision to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and increase STEM majors by 50%?” Data on consultants (identities, costs, data provided).</p>	<p>“We support the Educational Policy and Technology committee working towards answering parts A, B, and D, and the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting answering part C.”</p>	<p>“We support the work already completed by the undergraduate committee and its Resolution 20/7 which was on the Senate Agenda for December 13, 2019 and approved in amended form by Senate vote”</p>
<p>Petition Item #4: “should the charges of the each of the five strategic planning committees be amended to address the best size and ideal STEM ratio for the undergraduate population?”</p>	<p>“Provided feedback from other faculty senate committees, we could support amendment of the charges to the strategic planning committees. Please see response.”</p>	<p>“We support not having constraints imposed upon research endeavors. The strategic planning committees should have latitude during the data collection/landscaping efforts to amend their charges if the committees’ analysis and iterative discussions indicates such revisions to the charges are warranted.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #5: “Should the four strategic planning committees appointed by the President report their findings to the</p>	<p>“In our purview.”</p>	<p>“Resolution was drafted, voted, and reported to FSEC on November 1st, 2019. It was presented but not voted on in the November Senate meeting. This resolution is designated as 20/8 was approved by the Senate in vote on December 13, 2019.”</p>

Faculty for approval and /or amendment before these reports are sent to the Strategic Planning Task Force or the GWU administration?"		
---	--	--

Table 3: Education Policy and Technology Committee (EPT) Responses to Assembly Petition

Question Posed to EPT	Purview of EPT	Response by EPT
<p>Petition Item #1: “Did the adoption of the strategic plan of increasing the ratio of STEM majors and significantly decreasing undergraduate enrollment properly follow recognized principles of shared governance?”</p>	<p>“While the Committee affirms the item’s concern regarding shared governance, it defers action to the Senate as it deliberates Resolution 20/9.”</p>	<p>“Decision taken on January 10: The Committee agreed that it will await the Senate’s deliberation on Resolution 20/9. It will then review the Resolution and vote via email whether to support it. The results of that vote will be considered its response to petition item #1 to be included in the Special Committee report.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #2: “What is the total cost (past and future) of the Culture Initiative?” Methodology and validation of survey instrument applied.</p>	<p>“The Committee views this item within its purview as related to questions of external consultation and informed decision making addressed in item #3.”</p>	<p>“The Education Policy and Technology Committee recognizes the importance of petition item #2 in that it requests information regarding external consultants/experts hired to design and implement the Culture Initiative. The committee views this information relevant in comparing the level and form of consultation that drove the strategic plan to cut undergraduate enrollment by 20% and increase STEM major ratio to 30%.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #3: A. “What data supported the decision to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and increase STEM majors by 50%?” Data on consultants (identities, costs, data provided).</p>	<p>“The Committee found this item to be within its purview.”</p>	<p>“The Committee drafted and approved a resolution for consideration by Faculty Senate (20/7). In item #3 of the resolution, the Committee posed seven specific questions to the administration (questions a - h).” In this same resolution, item #4: “the committee affirmed its position that the strategic planning initiative must not in any way adversely affect the following elements critical to GWU and its student body: diversity; financial aid; the quality of student experience; and the quality of its academics.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #4: “should the charges of the each of the five strategic planning committees be amended to address the best size and ideal STEM ratio for the undergraduate population?”</p>	<p>No response.</p>	<p>No response.</p>
<p>Petition Item #5: “Should the four strategic planning</p>	<p>“The Committee found this item to be within its purview.”</p>	<p>“The Committee drafted and approved a resolution for consideration by Faculty Senate (20/7). In item</p>

<p>committees appointed by the President report their findings to the Faculty for approval and /or amendment before these reports are sent to the Strategic Planning Task Force or the GWU administration?"</p>		<p>#1 of the resolution, the Committee agreed with this proposed action. In item #2, it also affirmed that the Strategic Planning Task Force also submit its findings for response to Faculty Senate and its committees before submitting it to the BOT and President.</p>
---	--	--

Table 4: Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) Responses to Assembly Petition

Question Posed to PEAFF	Purview of PEAFF	Response by PEAFF
<p>Petition Item #1: “Did the adoption of the strategic plan of increasing the ratio of STEM majors and significantly decreasing undergraduate enrollment properly follow recognized principles of shared governance?”</p>	<p>“Shared governance is an issue with which the PEAFF Committee, among other committees, is concerned.”</p>	<p>“Committee members expressed concern regarding whether shared governance had been respected in the adoption of elements of the strategic plan, and that remains a matter of interest to the committee.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #2: “What is the total cost (past and future) of the Culture Initiative?” Methodology and validation of survey instrument applied.</p>	<p>“These issues did not appear directly germane to the matters of professional conduct and academic freedom that fall within the PEAFF Committee’s jurisdiction.”</p>	<p>No response.</p>
<p>Petition Item #3: A. “What data supported the decision to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and increase STEM majors by 50%?” Data on consultants (identities, costs, data provided).</p>	<p>“These issues did not appear directly germane to the matters of professional conduct and academic freedom that fall within the PEAFF Committee’s jurisdiction.”</p>	<p>No response.</p>
<p>Petition Item #4: “should the charges of the each of the five strategic planning committees be amended to address the best size and ideal STEM ratio for the undergraduate population?”</p>	<p>“These issues did not appear directly germane to the matters of professional conduct and academic freedom that fall within the PEAFF Committee’s jurisdiction.”</p>	<p>“With respect to item 4.4, the PEAFF Committee expressed support for encouraging team-based and multidisciplinary research, while also reaffirming the importance of academic freedom as it is reflected in the Faculty Code.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #5: “Should the four strategic planning committees appointed by the President report</p>	<p>“Shared governance is an issue with which the PEAFF Committee, among other</p>	<p>“PEAFF members expressed support for proposals that the strategic planning committees report their findings to the faculty. Members also recognized that other Senate committees, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the Senate as a whole are</p>

<p>their findings to the Faculty for approval and /or amendment before these reports are sent to the Strategic Planning Task Force or the GWU administration?”</p>	<p>committees, is concerned.”</p>	<p>considering the timing and other modalities of such reporting and consultation. Such proposals remain a matter of interest to the committee as one means of facilitating shared governance.”</p>
--	-----------------------------------	---

Table 5: Fiscal Planning & Budgeting (FPB) Responses to Assembly Petition

Question Posed to FPB	Purview of FPB	Response by FPB
<p>Petition Item #1: “Did the adoption of the strategic plan of increasing the ratio of STEM majors and significantly decreasing undergraduate enrollment properly follow recognized principles of shared governance?”</p>	<p>“Yes.”</p>	<p>“The chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee will resume monthly meetings with Executive VP Diaz in Spring 2020.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #2: “What is the total cost (past and future) of the Culture Initiative?” Methodology and validation of survey instrument applied.</p>	<p>“The question is relevant as costs are part of the committee’s charge.”</p>	<p>“Without the data the committee could not assess the costs.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #3: A. “What data supported the decision to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and increase STEM majors by 50%?” Data on consultants (identities, costs, data provided).</p>	<p>“Yes.”</p>	<p>“Provost Maltzman presented his analysis of the impact of the proposed reduction in enrollment both on student quality/diversity to the committee. This analysis was included in the committee’s report to the faculty senate at its November meeting.”</p> <p>“The committee discussed President LeBlanc’s Dec. 13 report on the undergraduate enrollment reductions proposed for FY 2021.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #4: “should the charges of the each of the five strategic planning committees be amended to address the best size and ideal STEM ratio for the undergraduate population?”</p>	<p>“Yes.”</p>	<p>“The committee anticipates having some preliminary estimates of budget impact of the enrollment cuts by the time of the Feb. 25 faculty assembly.”</p> <p>“The committee is in the process of getting information on the budgetary impact of cutting undergraduate enrollment both from the administration and from the deans of the schools that are affected.”</p>
<p>Petition Item #5: “Should the four strategic planning committees appointed by the President report their findings to the</p>	<p>“Yes.”</p>	<p>“The committee reviewed the draft reports of the four strategic planning committees as requested by the chair of the faculty senate executive committee. The main comment was that achieving a number of the recommendations of the committees would require either significant new fiscal resources or</p>

Faculty for approval and /or amendment before these reports are sent to the Strategic Planning Task Force or the GWU administration?”		reallocation of existing resources. This in turn should involve significant consultation with the schools and the faculty.”
---	--	---



FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS, SALARIES AND PROMOTION POLICIES (ASPP)

ASPP Committee Response to Faculty Assembly Petition Points dated October 6, 2019

Here is the ASPP Committee response to the Faculty Assembly Resolutions dated October 6, 2019 regarding the proposed reduction in undergraduate enrollments and potential elevation of 10 doctoral programs to national preeminence level.

- a) GW faculty need a voice in the decisions being made as well as transparency in the process, as required by the Faculty Code. We also need to keep the needs of our students in mind and possibly add undergraduate programs in data management and data skills.
- b) GW needs to ensure that increase in STEM areas do not cause a decline in faculty appointments in humanities and other non-STEM areas. This concerns not only regular faculty hires but also part time and specialized faculty hires.
- c) While the number of undergraduates in five schools (CCAS, ESIA, GWSPH, SB, SEAS) increased by 1284 (13.81%) over 5 years between 2013 and 2018, the number of regular full time faculty increased only by 15 (1.82%) [See attached Table]. When we increase enrollments in STEM areas, we must ensure that the numbers of tenured lines also increase commensurately.
- d) The criteria for the selection of 10 or so doctoral programs that will be elevated to national preeminence level ought to be publicly described and discussed so the selection and vetting process is, and seen to be, unbiased. GW must ensure that the other existing doctoral programs are not simply allowed to wither thereby reducing the diversity of graduate offerings at GW?

Here is the ASPP committee's response to the resolutions of Faculty Assembly:

RC1: *“Did the adoption of the strategic plan of increasing the ratio of STEM majors and significantly decreasing undergraduate enrollment properly follow recognized principles of shared governance?”*

ASPP Committee Response: GWU did not properly follow the principles of shared governance as the 20% decrease came down from the Board of Trustees.

RC2: *“What is the total cost (past and future) of the Culture Initiative? How much money has and will be spent to hire outside consultants including the Disney Institute? Did the Disney Institute culture survey and focus groups use objective methods as recognized in peer-reviewed scientific literature produced by fields specializing in survey design and qualitative interviewing? Are the results of the culture survey and focus group scientifically valid?”*

ASPP Committee Response: Not known. We do not have any of this information.

RC3: *“What data supported the decision to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and increase STEM majors by 50%? Who specifically at GWU and who specifically from outside were involved in these decisions? What was the logic that supported these decisions? If outside consultants were involved in these decisions, how were they chosen, how much were they paid, what data was provided to the consultants, and what did the consultants report?”*

ASPP Committee Response: We have no knowledge.

RC4: *“As no objective and responsible research process involves starting with conclusions, should the charges of the each of the five strategic planning committees (World Class Faculty, High Quality Undergraduate Education, Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education, High Impact Research, Strategic Planning Task Force) be amended to include the following charges: 1. What is the best size of the undergraduate student body for delivering on the University mission to promote high quality education and high impact research? 2. Is there in fact an ideal ratio of STEM majors to the entire undergraduate population? If so, how should it be determined, and what should it be? 3. Given that "the mission of the George Washington University is to educate individuals in liberal arts, languages, sciences, learned professions, and other courses and subjects of study, and to conduct scholarly research and publish the findings of such research," and that "the university is committed to recruiting, admitting and enrolling undergraduate and graduate students drawn from varying backgrounds or identities throughout all schools and departments," what impact will changing the student body's size and composition have on the curricular, research, and diversity and inclusion missions of the university? 4. How can GWU produce high impact research that does not require its faculty to conduct team-based scholarship? In which instances does top-down mandates for team research undermine creativity and impact?”*

ASPP Committee Responses:

- 1. Best size: We have no idea.**
- 2. STEM ratio: This information is probably available somewhere but we don't know.**
- 3. Impact: This needs to be determined. ASPP committee supports the mission of the university.**

4. Team based research: The premise is unclear. What stops team-based research?

RC5: “Should the four strategic planning committees appointed by the President (World Class Faculty, High Quality Undergraduate Education, Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education, High Impact Research) report their findings to the Faculty for approval and / or amendment before these reports are sent to the Strategic Planning Task Force or the GWU administration?”

ASPP Committee Responses: Yes. The timeline for the strategic planning committees is being modified currently.

Respectfully Submitted

Murli M. Gupta, Chair, ASPP Committee
November 22, 2019

Enrollments and Faculty Size (2012-2019)

Undergraduate Enrollments and Faculty Size 2012-2019 updated								
FT Ugrad enrollments data				Faculty data				
Residential schools				Residential schools				
CCAS, ESIA, GWSPH, SB, SEAS				CCAS, ESIA, GWSPH, SB, SEAS				
Source: Cheryl Beil (November 7, 2019)				Source: Cheryl Beil (November 7, 2019)				
Year	FT Ugrad Population	Annual Change	% change	Regular Faculty size (TT+NTT)	Annual Change	% change	Specialized Faculty size	Part time Faculty size
2012	9488			794			45	1122
2013	9296	-192	-2.02%	822	28	3.53%	49	1004
2014	9489	193	2.08%	850	28	3.41%	49	953
2015	9805	316	3.33%	835	-15	-1.76%	50	945
2016	9963	158	1.61%	829	-6	-0.72%	59	928
2017	10256	293	2.94%	826	-3	-0.36%	65	949
2018	10580	324	3.16%	837	11	1.33%	70	962
2019	10199	-381	-3.60%	Data not available			Data not available	Data not available
5 year Change between 2013 and 2018	1284	13.81%		15	1.82%		21	-42



A RESOLUTION ON INVOLVEMENT OF FACULTY AND ITS ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES IN SHAPING STRATEGIC PLANNING (EDUCATION POLICY & TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE) (20/7)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan stipulates in Article 2, section 4.2.... “The Assembly shall have the power to direct the Senate to include in the agenda of the Senate or any of its committees, or to study and report back to the Assembly, or to take such other action as may be appropriate with respect to any matter of concern to the Assembly”; and

WHEREAS, the Assembly met on October 22, 2019 and by voice vote approved a petition calling for Senate action, through four of its committees and through the Senate as a whole on six items related to the culture initiative and strategic planning process; and

WHEREAS, the fifth of the six items approved by the Assembly at its October 22, 2019 meeting reads “Given the faculty’s exclusive expertise in determining and delivering curriculum and in conducting research, the Assembly directs the Faculty Senate as well as the Senate committees on a) Educational Policy & Technology, b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and d) Research, to include on each of their respective agendas the following item: “Should the four strategic planning committees appointed by the President (World Class Faculty, High Quality Undergraduate Education, Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education, High Impact Research) report their findings to the Faculty for approval and /or amendment before these reports are sent to the Strategic Planning Task Force or the GWU administration?” The Senate and each of the four committees mentioned above (a) Educational Policy & Technology, b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and d) Research) shall report their findings at a Senate meeting by November 8, 2019”; and

WHEREAS, the third of six items approved by the Assembly at its October 22, 2019 meeting reads The Assembly directs the Faculty Senate as well as the Senate committees on a) Educational Policy & Technology, b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and d) Research, to include on each of their respective agendas the following items: “*What data supported the decision to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and increase STEM majors by 50%? Who specifically at GWU and who specifically from outside were involved in these decisions? What was the logic that supported these decisions? If outside consultants were involved in these decisions, how were they chosen, how much were they paid, what data was provided to the consultants, and what did the consultants report?*” The Senate and each of the four committees mentioned above (a) Educational Policy & Technology, b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and d) Research) shall report the entirety of their findings on the same webpage where the Senate publishes the minutes of its meetings by December 20, 2019 (<https://facultysenate.gwu.edu/minutes>) and notify each member of the Faculty Assembly of the electronic location of this report that shall remain on the website of the Senate until at least February 15, 2020; and

WHEREAS, on July 9, 2019 GW Today reported that the strategic planning decisions made prior to and without faculty input had been based on information from “outside experts on topics ranging from redefining the urban research university to building distinguished graduate programs to promoting faculty scholarship and research impact.” <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/message-president-leblanc-strategic-planning-process>; and

WHEREAS, AAUP guidelines direct universities to secure meaningful faculty input and approval and oversight before implementing changes to policies related to general education, curriculum, research, subject matter of instruction, institutional policies on student admissions;¹ **NOW, THEREFORE**

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

1. That the strategic planning committees for World Class Faculty, High Quality Undergraduate Education, Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education, and High Impact Research should each report their findings to each of the following committees: (a) Educational Policy & Technology, (b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, (c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and (d) Research for comment, input, and/or endorsement before these reports, with comments and/or input from the Senate and its committees attached as a part of the reports, are sent to the Strategic Planning Task Force and/or the GWU administration;
2. That the Strategic Planning Task Force submit its report to the Faculty Senate and each of the following committees (a) Educational Policy & Technology, (b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, (c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and (d) Research for approval, or amendment, or disapproval before submitting its report, as potentially amended by the Senate and its committees, to the President and Board of Trustees;
3. On behalf of the Faculty, the Educational Policy and Technology Committee requests information from the President on the strategic planning process that was undertaken starting in 2018 and which has not already been released by the President and Administration including
 - a. What data supported the decision to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and increase STEM majors to 30%?
 - b. Who specifically at GWU, including faculty, was involved in these decisions?
 - c. Which outside experts (firms, names of partners, and names of individuals who worked on the project for GWU) were involved in these decisions?

¹ **AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities**

“The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board.”

“With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process”

<https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities##4>

- d. What was the evidence used by GWU administration and by outside consultants to support recommendations to increase STEM and decrease undergraduate student enrollment?
 - e. How were the outside experts chosen? Was it a bid process? Which firms were not chosen? What analysis indicated that GWU experts including the Senate Committees could not conduct this analysis?
 - f. What were the specific sources of the data provided to the consultants and how were they utilized in the decision process?
 - g. What data did the consultants use to evaluate impacts on student body diversity, retention rates, and tuition discounts?
 - h. What were the consultants' specific outputs—i.e., how did they report their findings?
4. And that through the above-listed paragraphs of this resolution, the Education Policy and Technology Committee affirms its position that the strategic planning initiative must not in any way adversely affect the following elements critical to GWU and its student body: diversity; financial aid; the quality of student experience; and the quality of its academics.

Educational Policy and Technology Committee
of the Faculty Senate
November 22, 2019



A RESOLUTION ON INVOLVEMENT OF FACULTY AND ITS ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES IN SHAPING STRATEGIC PLANNING (RESEARCH COMMITTEE) (20/8)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan stipulates in Article 2, section 4.2.... “The Assembly shall have the power to direct the Senate to include in the agenda of the Senate or any of its committees, or to study and report back to the Assembly, or to take such other action as may be appropriate with respect to any matter of concern to the Assembly”; and

WHEREAS, the Assembly met on October 22, 2019 and by voice vote approved a petition calling for Senate action, through four of its committees and through the Senate as a whole on six items related to the culture initiative and strategic planning process; and

WHEREAS, the fifth of the six items approved by the Assembly at its October 22, 2019 meeting reads “Given the faculty’s exclusive expertise in determining and delivering curriculum and in conducting research, the Assembly directs the Faculty Senate as well as the Senate committees on a) Educational Policy & Technology, b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and d) Research, to include on each of their respective agendas the following item: “Should the four strategic planning committees appointed by the President (World Class Faculty, High Quality Undergraduate Education, Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education, High Impact Research) report their findings to the Faculty for approval and /or amendment before these reports are sent to the Strategic Planning Task Force or the GWU administration?” The Senate and each of the four committees mentioned above (a) Educational Policy & Technology, b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and d) Research) shall report their findings at a Senate meeting by November 8, 2019”; and

WHEREAS, AAUP guidelines direct universities to secure meaningful faculty input and approval and oversight before implementing changes to policies related to general education, curriculum, research, subject matter of instruction, institutional policies on student admissions;¹ **NOW, THEREFORE**

¹ AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities

“The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board.”

“With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process”

<https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities##4>

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY**

1. That that the strategic planning committees for World Class Faculty, High Quality Undergraduate Education, Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education, and High Impact Research should each report their findings to each of the following committees: (a) Educational Policy & Technology, (b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, (c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and (d) Research for comment, input, and/or endorsement before these reports, with comments and/or input from the Senate and its committees attached as a part of the reports, are sent to the Strategic Planning Task Force and/or the GWU administration; and
2. That the Strategic Planning Task Force submit its report to the Faculty Senate and each of the following committees (a) Educational Policy & Technology, (b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, (c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and (d) Research for approval, or amendment, or disapproval before submitting its report, as potentially amended by the Senate and its committees, to the President and Board of Trustees;

Research Committee
of the Faculty Senate
November 22, 2019



A RESOLUTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE WITH RESPECT TO SIZE, COMPOSITION, AND QUALITY OF THE UNDERGRADUATE CLASS (20/9)

WHEREAS, the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) jointly issued a directive stating:

“The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board.”
(Section 5)

“With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process” *(Note 4)*

“Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation of governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.” *(Section 2b)*¹;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan, Article III, Section 1 (4) states that the Senate shall “be the Faculty agency to which the President initially presents information and which he consults concerning proposed changes in existing policies or promulgation of new policies”;

WHEREAS, the Senate, and in particular its Educational Policy and Technology Committee, has in the past consistently been consulted and has contributed to the formulation of policy about the size, composition, and quality of the undergraduate student body;

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc announced on July 9, 2019, a plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the relative proportions of the student majors and

¹ <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

therefore to alter the curricular program of the university² without having previously consulted in sufficient detail with the relevant Senate committees and the Senate as a whole and proceeded to implement the plans with the enrollment of the 2019/2020 class;

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc stated repeatedly that changes to the undergraduate student body will not cause diversity to go down “one iota”³ and the chair of the Board of Trustees reaffirmed that diversity will not be impacted as a result of this plan⁴, while the Senate and its Committees have not yet received or been given the opportunity to evaluate any compelling evidence that these current diversity and academic quality standards can be maintained while simultaneously reducing the size of its student body and increasing STEM majors; **NOW, THEREFORE,**

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- 1) That the process of adoption and implementation of plans to reduce the size of the student body and to increase the ratio of STEM majors was inconsistent with established principles of shared governance;
- 2) That shared governance requires meaningful input and oversight by the Senate as a whole and by all relevant Senate Committees prior to implementation or announcement of major initiatives;
- 3) That the administration’s and Board of Trustees’ commitment to diversity is to be applauded;
- 4) That the Faculty Senate calls on the university to develop plans that raise academic excellence and that maintain or increase diversity and expand inclusion; and
- 5) That the Senate asks the administration to refrain from further implementing plans to reduce enrollment and increase STEM until after a) the financial implications of these plans are validated by the Senate; b) it submits a valid model under which academic quality and diversity are not diminished; and c) its plans are considered, debated, and accepted through recognized processes of shared governance.

Originally Submitted by Guillermo Orti, Daniel Schwartz, and Ioannis Eleftherianos
November 19, 2019

Revision Submitted by Guillermo Orti, Daniel Schwartz, and Ioannis Eleftherianos
December 28, 2019

Amendments to the Resolving Clauses Adopted by the Faculty Senate

² <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/message-president-leblanc-strategic-planning-process>

³ <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/faculty-president-leblanc-discuss-strategic-plan-objectives-process>

⁴ Faculty Senate Minutes for October 11, 2019 Regular meeting

January 10, 2020

Amendments to the Whereas Clauses Proposed by Special Drafting Committee
January 20, 2020

Office of the President
1918 F Street, NW
Washington, DC 20052

January 17, 2020

Dear President LeBlanc,

I write on behalf of the Special Committee established by Resolution 20/6 to respond to the October 22, 2019 Faculty Assembly petition. As you know, the petition requested information on the data and decisions informing the strategic planning process.

In this letter, we are following up on particular points of data that have not yet been provided to the Senate committees.

For item #3 of the petition, questions a. to h. of Resolution 20/7 (introduced on November 8, 2019 and approved by the Senate on December 13, 2019), the Senate requested specific information. In your December 13, 2019 presentation to the Senate, you provided partial answers to some of those questions, while others have not yet been addressed.

We ask that you please provide complete answers to the questions listed below by **January 31, 2020**. Your responses will be documented in our report to the Faculty Senate, which is due to the Executive Committee on February 3, 2020 and will be reviewed by the full senate in its February 14, 2020 meeting.

In your December 13, 2019 presentation you stated that "The [Committee on Strategic Enrollment] consulted with various GW offices as well as outside experts, and studied hundreds of pages of data and reports." We seek the following clarification and information:

(1) When was the Committee on Strategic Enrollment formed and who served on it? Please provide a complete list of the individuals and offices at GWU and any other members who served on the committee. [As per Resolution 20/7, Question b.]

(2) Which outside experts (firms, names of partners, and names of individuals who worked on the project for GWU) were involved in these decisions? [Resolution 20/7, Question c.]

(3) How were the outside experts chosen? Was it a bid process? Which firms were not chosen? What analysis indicated that GWU experts including the Senate Committees could not conduct this analysis? [Resolution 20/7, Question e.]

(4) While the committee understands that it was "not possible for [you] to share every page of data reviewed by the committee due to sheer volume," in your December 13 presentation, nevertheless we ask that you please provide the specific internal and external data that the Committee on Strategic Enrollment used to determine the 20% figure among the "hundreds of

pages of data and reports” (beyond the general information provided in slides 3-8 of your December 13, 2019 presentation). [As per Resolution 20/7, Questions a. and d.]

(5) In your presentation, you indicated that the Committee on Strategic Enrollment consulted reports from then Provost Maltzman. Did Provost Maltzman’s reports recommend cutting enrollment and increasing STEM majors? If not, which individuals, offices, models, or consultants did recommend making cuts to enrollment and increasing STEM majors, and what **specific data** supported those recommendations? [As per Resolution 20/7, Questions a. and d.]

(6) In your presentation you stated that “[the Committee on Strategic Enrollment] reviewed some comparative data between GW and both aspirational and peer private universities, and they brought outside experts to the annual Board retreat to discuss these issues.” Please provide the **specific sets and sources of these comparative data** (beyond slide 8 of your December 13, 2019 presentation). [As per Resolution 20/7, Questions a., d., e., f., g., and h.]

(7) Please list these outside experts who presented their research at the annual retreat and provide copies of their full reports, remarks, and presentations. [As per Resolution 20/7, Questions c., f., g., and h.].

(8) In your December 13 presentation you referred to nation-wide data predicting a decrease in the size of the college applicant pool in the US. We seek clarification on how this national trend applies to GWU. Namely, slide 6 of the presentation indicates a reduction of only 1% in expected college-age applicants from the Middle States region and an increase of 7% in applicants from states in the southern region including Virginia. Given these numbers, and the regional composition of GWU’s typical applicant pool, what **specific data or models** indicate the expected size of GWU’s own applicant pool in the time period (2024-2025) considered by slide 6? [As per Resolution 20/7, Questions a. and d.]

Thank you for your time and attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wagner
Danial Schwartz
Joseph Cordes
Guillermo Orti
Jason Zara
Kausik Sarkar

Office of the President
1918 F Street, NW
Washington, DC 20052

January 27, 2020

Dear President LeBlanc,

I write again on behalf of the Special Committee established by Resolution 20/6 to respond to the October 22, 2019 Faculty Assembly petition.

In this letter, we are following up on petition item #2 as it has been taken up by the Faculty Senate Research Committee and the Education Policy and Technology Committee. Both committees seek more information on this matter, with the Education Policy and Technology Committee expressly recognizing:

... the importance of petition item #2 in that it requests information regarding external consultants/experts hired to design and implement the Culture Initiative. The committee views this information relevant in comparing the level and form of consultation that drove the strategic plan to cut undergraduate enrollment by 20% and increase STEM major ratio to 30%.

We therefore ask that you please provide complete answers to the questions listed below (included in petition item #2) by **January 31, 2020**. Your responses will be documented in our report to the Faculty Senate, which is due to the Executive Committee on February 3, 2020, and will be reviewed by the full senate in its February 14, 2020 meeting.

- What is the total cost (past and future) of the Culture Initiative?
- How much money has and will be spent to hire outside consultants including the Disney Institute?
- Did the Disney Institute culture survey and focus groups use objective methods as recognized in peer-reviewed scientific literature produced by fields specializing in survey design and qualitative interviewing? If so, please itemize by name which methods and literatures were used.
- Are the results of the culture survey and focus group scientifically valid? If so, please provide documentation that links the survey instruments to peer-reviewed literature that validates those specific instruments.

Thank you for your time and attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wagner
Daniel Schwartz
Joseph Cordes

Guillermo Orti
Jason Zara
Kausik Sarkar

February 5, 2020

Special Committee of the Faculty Senate:

Sarah Wagner
Sylvia Marotta-Walters
Steve Charnovitz
Daniel Schwartz
Joseph Cordes
Guillermo Orti
Jason Zara
Kausik Sarkar

Dear Colleagues:

I write in response to your letter dated January 17, 2020, regarding questions related to the Strategic Planning process.

(1) The Board of Trustees Committee on Strategic Enrollment was established by Nelson Carbonell on July 1, 2018, during his term as Board Chair. The committee's mission was to establish overarching strategic enrollment priorities that support the educational and research missions of the university. The committee consisted of the following trustees:

Avram Tucker, Chair
Gabbi Baker
Christine Barth
Mark Chichester
Peter Harrison
Todd Klein
Ellen Zane
Nelson Carbonell, ex-officio
Thomas LeBlanc, ex-officio

The Office of the Provost, specifically Forrest Maltzman and Laurie Koehler, staffed the committee. As a committee of the Board of Trustees, there were no other members. Trustee deliberations, including meeting minutes and materials, are confidential.

(2) Provost Maltzman engaged Brian Zucker from Human Capital Research Corporation to assist with enrollment modeling. We have used Human Capital Research Corporation since 2013.

(3) The Board Leadership chose a series of outside experts to provide commentary on the future of higher education and the external landscape within which GW operates. We selected these individuals because they are knowledgeable, well known, and well respected in the higher education arena. We did not ask the outside experts to provide any information unique to GW, or to make any specific recommendations. The speakers included AAU President Mary Sue Coleman, Moody's Associate Managing Director Susan Fitzgerald, Northeastern University President Emeritus Richard Freeland,

former University of Texas at Brownsville President Juliet Garcia, Digital Science CEO Daniel Hook, Council of Graduate Schools President Suzanne Ortega, and 2U Founder and President (and GW alumnus) Chip Paucek. As these individuals were part of the Board Retreat, their presentations, remarks, and research are confidential. I will note, however, that Susan Fitzgerald's colleague Dennis Gephardt presented a similar presentation to the Faculty Senate on December 7, 2018, at the invitation of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair, who participated in the Retreat.

(4) During my presentation at the Faculty Senate meeting on December 13, 2019, I shared summaries of research and materials that the Committee on Strategic Enrollment reviewed. Included in this response are the publicly available presentations and reports. They include the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) Knocking at the College Door report, the Institute of International Education Open Doors report, the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) Tuition Discounting Study, and the Council of Graduate Schools Graduate Enrollment and Degrees study.

(5) As I have mentioned in my remarks and presentations, and is important to reiterate, there was no specific report, consultant, singular data point, or recommendation that led the board, with my concurrence, to the decision to reduce the undergraduate, residential headcount and increase the fraction of STEM majors. The recent increase of 14 percent in the undergraduate population at GW is well documented. The decrease in high school-age students attending college has been well documented in industry publications such as the Chronicle of Higher Education and Inside Higher Ed. The trustees, as fiduciaries, regularly discuss these issues when considering future strategic opportunities and challenges. I refer you to answer (3) for additional detail.

(6) I refer you to answer (3).

(7) The outside experts were not providing research, but instead providing commentary. Additionally, I refer you to answer (3).

(8) I refer you to answer (5).

In my two and a half years as President and throughout my transition, it has been the collective perspective of the GW community that we should aspire to preeminence as a comprehensive research university. To strive toward that goal, we have to not only focus on and strengthen those areas in which we are already widely known, but also expand our capacities in the STEM disciplines.

The faculty-led Strategic Planning committees have completed great work in preparing interim committee reports and developing initial ideas to inspire and engage the campus community. The only aspect of the Strategic Plan prescribed by the Board of Trustees was the reduction in the undergraduate residential headcount by 20 percent, and an increase in STEM majors to 30 percent. How we meet those goals and how we achieve preeminence in all of the pillars of the plan are the work of the Strategic Planning committees. It is my hope that we, as a university community, will take advantage of the Strategic Planning process to rally around the work of our faculty-led committees, and

their collaboration with the Faculty Senate committees, to provide input and feedback on the interim committee reports.

As I have said previously, this is a strategic plan that we will phase in over the next five years, adapting to external circumstances as they evolve. I am committed to ongoing dialogue and engagement with the Faculty Senate as we implement the Strategic Plan.

I appreciate your strong advocacy and engagement on this very important process. I ask now that we work together to move the university forward in a positive and constructive way and to plan for the best possible future for GW.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Thomas J. LeBlanc". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Thomas J. LeBlanc

January 31, 2020

Special Committee of the Faculty Senate:

Sarah Wagner
Sylvia Marotta-Walters
Steve Charnovitz
Daniel Schwartz
Joseph Cordes
Guillermo Orti
Jason Zara
Kausik Sarkar

Dear Colleagues:

I write in response to your letter dated January 27, 2020, regarding questions related to the strategic initiative on Institutional Culture.

The university launched the Institutional Culture initiative to improve the experience of all members of the university community. Since its inception, the initiative and its faculty and staff leadership have accomplished several important goals.

The initiative articulated the university's common purpose, values, and service priorities to unite our community in our work. These foundational elements are critical to the functions of a high-performing organization; yet with the exception of values, none had been previously identified at GW.

The initiative also has driven many significant decisions that have improved living, learning, and working on our campuses for all students, faculty, and staff, including implementing the new winter break schedule and enhancing tuition remission for employees; directing resources to community space and improving our campuses; making improvements to safety and security, including installing more than 1,400 tap access locks across 15 residence halls and other enhancements such as classroom and building access control; and hiring our first Chief People Officer to oversee a reorientation in human resources and benefits that puts people first. The answers to your questions are as follows:

- (1) Previously, I disclosed costs and was reminded that our contractual obligations require confidentiality.
- (2) This is a broad question. I refer you to answer (1).
- (3) The survey was designed to assess the university's culture and is widely used by many organizations for that purpose.

- (4) Many members of the university community agreed with the assessment, and to my knowledge, there was no significant disagreement.

I want to reiterate that the Institutional Culture initiative is about GW and not an external organization. The work and accomplishments, to date, have all been initiated, produced and prepared, and driven by GW and our community. Our consultants provided facilitation but the work was ours. I look forward to working with you, as colleagues, to move the university forward.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Thomas J. LeBlanc". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial 'T'.

Thomas J. LeBlanc



A RESOLUTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE WITH RESPECT TO SIZE, COMPOSITION, AND QUALITY OF THE UNDERGRADUATE CLASS (20/9)

WHEREAS, the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) jointly issued a directive stating:

“The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board.” (*Section 5*)

“With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process” (*Note 4*)

“Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation of governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.” (*Section 2b*)¹;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan, Article III, Section 1 (4) states that the Senate shall “be the Faculty agency to which the President initially presents information and which he consults concerning proposed changes in existing policies or promulgation of new policies”;

WHEREAS, the Senate, and in particular its Educational Policy and Technology Committee, has in the past consistently been consulted and has contributed to the formulation of policy about the size, composition, and quality of the undergraduate student body;

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc announced on July 9, 2019, a plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the relative proportions of the student majors and therefore to alter the curricular program of the university² without having previously consulted in sufficient detail

¹ <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

² <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/message-president-leblanc-strategic-planning-process>

with the relevant Senate committees and the Senate as a whole and proceeded to implement the plans with the enrollment of the 2019/2020 class;

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc stated repeatedly that changes to the undergraduate student body will not cause diversity to go down “one iota”³ and the chair of the Board of Trustees reaffirmed that diversity will not be impacted as a result of this plan⁴, while the Senate and its Committees have not yet received or been given the opportunity to evaluate any compelling evidence that these current diversity and academic quality standards can be maintained while simultaneously reducing the size of its student body and increasing STEM majors; **NOW, THEREFORE**,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- 1) That the process of adoption and implementation of plans to reduce the size of the student body and to increase the ratio of STEM majors was inconsistent with established principles of shared governance;
- 2) That shared governance requires meaningful input and oversight by the Senate as a whole and by all relevant Senate Committees prior to implementation or announcement of major initiatives;
- 3) That the administration’s and Board of Trustees’ commitment to diversity is to be applauded;
- 4) That the Faculty Senate calls on the university to develop plans that raise academic excellence and that maintain or increase diversity and expand inclusion; and
- 5) That the Senate asks the administration to refrain from further implementing plans to reduce enrollment and increase STEM until after a) the financial implications of these plans are validated by the Senate; b) it submits a valid model under which academic quality and diversity are not diminished; and c) its plans are considered, debated, and accepted through recognized processes of shared governance.

Originally Submitted by Guillermo Orti, Daniel Schwartz, and Ioannis Eleftherianos
November 19, 2019

Revision Submitted by Guillermo Orti, Daniel Schwartz, and Ioannis Eleftherianos
December 28, 2019

Amendments to the Resolving Clauses Adopted by the Faculty Senate
January 10, 2020

Amendments to the Whereas Clauses Proposed by Special Drafting Committee
January 20, 2020

Adopted by the Faculty Senate
February 14, 2020

³ <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/faculty-president-leblanc-discuss-strategic-plan-objectives-process>

⁴ Faculty Senate Minutes for October 11, 2019 Regular meeting

Version Reflecting Edits Made in January Senate Meeting
and by Resolving Clause Drafting Committee



A RESOLUTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE WITH RESPECT TO SIZE, COMPOSITION, AND QUALITY OF THE UNDERGRADUATE CLASS (20/9)

WHEREAS, the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) jointly issued a directive stating:

“The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board.”
(Section 5)

“With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process” *(Note 4)*

“Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation of governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.” *(Section 2b)*¹;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan, Article III, Section 1 (4) states that the Senate shall “be the Faculty agency to which the President initially presents information and which he consults concerning proposed changes in existing policies or promulgation of new policies”;

WHEREAS, the Senate, and in particular its Educational Policy and Technology Committee, has in the past consistently been consulted and has contributed to the formulation of policy about the size, composition, and quality of the undergraduate student body;

¹ <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

Deleted: <object>
Formatted: Centered

Deleted: ¶
Formatted: Centered
Deleted: Resolution on Shared Governance
Deleted: with friendly amendments
Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: ¶
Formatted: Indent Left: 0.94"
Deleted: WHEREAS, The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” states ¶
Formatted: Indent Left: 0", Hanging: 0.94", Right: 0"
Deleted: >

Moved (insertion) [1]
Deleted: ve
Deleted: informed and
Deleted: intended changes in policy, prior to action;

Deleted: of 7

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc announced on July 9, 2019, a plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the relative proportions of the student majors and therefore to alter the curricular program of the university² without having previously consulted in sufficient detail with the relevant Senate committees and the Senate as a whole and proceeded to implement the plans with the enrollment of the 2019/2020 class;

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc stated repeatedly that changes to the undergraduate student body will not cause diversity to go down “one iota”³ and the chair of the Board of Trustees reaffirmed that diversity will not be impacted as a result of this plan⁴, while the Senate and its Committees have not yet received or been given the opportunity to evaluate any compelling evidence that these current diversity and academic quality standards can be maintained while simultaneously reducing the size of its student body and increasing STEM majors: **NOW, THEREFORE,**

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- 1) That the process of adoption and implementation of plans to reduce the size of the student body and to increase the ratio of STEM majors was inconsistent with established principles of shared governance;
- 2) That shared governance requires meaningful input and oversight by the Senate as a whole and by all relevant Senate Committees prior to implementation or announcement of major initiatives;
- 3) That the administration’s and Board of Trustees’ commitment to diversity is to be applauded;
- 4) That the Faculty Senate calls on the university to develop plans that raise academic excellence and that maintain or increase diversity and expand inclusion; and
- 5) That the Senate asks the administration to refrain from further implementing plans to reduce enrollment and increase STEM until after a) the financial implications of these plans are validated by the Senate; b) it submits a valid model under which academic quality and diversity are not diminished; and c) its plans are considered, debated, and accepted through recognized processes of shared governance.

Originally Submitted by Guillermo Orti, Daniel Schwartz, and Ioannis Eleftherianos, November 19, 2019

Revision Submitted by Guillermo Orti, Daniel Schwartz, and Ioannis Eleftherianos

² <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/message-president-leblanc-strategic-planning-process>

³ <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/faculty-president-leblanc-discuss-strategic-plan-objectives-process>

⁴ Faculty Senate Minutes for October 11, 2019 Regular meeting

Moved (insertion) [2]
Formatted: Not Highlight
Deleted: ;²
Moved (insertion) [3]
Deleted: ;...³³ ... [1]
Moved up [2]: WHEREAS, President LeBlanc 2019, a plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the relative proportions of the student majors and therefore to alter the curricular program of the university;⁴ ... [3]
Deleted: WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan... [2]
Deleted: ¶
Deleted: adoption and implementation ... f plans to reduce... [4]
Deleted: violates established
Deleted: ¶
Deleted: 2) That merely informing the faculty of plans does... [5]
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"
Deleted: ¶ ... [6]
Deleted: ¶ That individual members of the Senate Executive... [7]
Deleted: ¶
Deleted: 4... That shared governance requires meaningful... [8]
Deleted: Senate Committees other than the Executive ... [9]
Deleted: .
Deleted: 5
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"
Deleted: ¶ That information concerning potential enrollm... [10]
Deleted: ¶ ... [11]
Deleted: President LeBlanc's
Deleted: .
Deleted: 7... That the Faculty Senate calls on the universi... [12]
Deleted: expand academic excellence, and to maintain of [13]
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.19"
Deleted: 8
Deleted: pause ...efrain from further implementing plans [14]
Formatted: Not Highlight
Formatted: Not Highlight
Deleted: a) its plans are considered, debated, and accepted... [15]
Formatted: Not Highlight
Deleted: ¶
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"
Deleted: with friendly amendments ... y ¶ ... [16]
Deleted: 28 ...ovDec...mber 19, ... [17]
Deleted: of 7

December 28, 2019

Amendments to the Resolving Clauses Adopted by the Faculty Senate
January 10, 2020

Amendments to the Whereas Clauses Proposed by Special Drafting Committee
January 20, 2020

Deleted:Page Break.....

Deleted: APPENDIX A: Charge to the Strategic planning committee on High Quality Education

<https://strategicplan.gwu.edu/guidance-strategic-planning-committees>

Charge to the Committee:
Under the assumption of a residential undergraduate population of 8400 students, of which 30% ultimately complete a STEM major, develop a strategy with measurable outcomes to attract and retain a high-quality student body, and recommendations for the educational opportunities that we should provide to our students. The process for determining the strategy for high quality undergraduate education should involve consideration of two key elements: (1) a high-quality undergraduate student body, and (2) a high-quality and distinctive undergraduate education. A baseline set of comparative benchmarking data will be provided to the committee with regularly reported items on undergraduate education in order to inform the committee's final recommendations. The committee's recommendations should adhere to the structure outlined below, include goals and initiatives by responding to the questions embedded within, and suggest metrics and resources required to achieve the goals.

Principles
Provide overarching guidance to be considered and adhered to in addressing the charge to the committee.

Goals
Based on these principles, and in response to the guiding questions below, establish the goals and define specific initiatives to realize the goals.
High-quality undergraduate student body

How do we define, recruit, retain, and graduate a high-quality student body?
Beyond financial aid strategies, what programs, facilities, and experiences should we exploit or develop to attract and retain this high-quality student body?

High-quality and distinctive undergraduate education
How do we expand our offerings in STEM education to attract more STEM majors and to provide STEM educational opportunities to all students?

How do we make the many distinctive educational opportunities available at GW (including the professional schools) accessible to every student?

How do we use our location to create academic offerings and opportunities that are available at no other institution?

Metrics
Determine metrics to measure progress toward achieving the goals for undergraduate education under this strategic plan.

Resources
List all resources required, including assumptions, to achieve the goals for undergraduate education.

.....Page Break.....

APPENDIX B: ... [18]

Deleted: of 7

Page 2: [1] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:43:00 PM
Page 2: [1] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:43:00 PM
Page 2: [2] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:44:00 PM
Page 2: [3] Moved to page 2 (Move #2)	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:41:00 PM
Page 2: [3] Moved to page 2 (Move #2)	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:41:00 PM
Page 2: [3] Moved to page 2 (Move #2)	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:41:00 PM
Page 2: [4] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:45:00 PM
Page 2: [4] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:45:00 PM
Page 2: [5] Deleted	Marotta-Walters, Sylvia A	1/13/20 2:28:00 PM
Page 2: [6] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:46:00 PM
Page 2: [7] Deleted	Marotta-Walters, Sylvia A	1/13/20 2:29:00 PM
Page 2: [8] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:46:00 PM
Page 2: [8] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:46:00 PM
Page 2: [9] Deleted	Marotta-Walters, Sylvia A	1/13/20 2:29:00 PM
Page 2: [10] Deleted	Marotta-Walters, Sylvia A	1/13/20 2:30:00 PM
Page 2: [11] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:46:00 PM
Page 2: [11] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:46:00 PM
Page 2: [12] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:47:00 PM
Page 2: [12] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:47:00 PM
Page 2: [12] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:47:00 PM
Page 2: [12] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:47:00 PM
Page 2: [12] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:47:00 PM

Page 2: [13] Deleted	Marotta-Walters, Sylvia A	1/13/20 2:32:00 PM
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/16/20 1:20:00 PM
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/16/20 1:20:00 PM
Page 2: [15] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/16/20 1:20:00 PM
Page 2: [15] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/16/20 1:20:00 PM
Page 2: [15] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/16/20 1:20:00 PM
Page 2: [16] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 4:04:00 PM
Page 2: [16] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 4:04:00 PM
Page 2: [16] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 4:04:00 PM
Page 2: [16] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 4:04:00 PM
Page 2: [16] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 4:04:00 PM
Page 2: [17] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:50:00 PM
Page 2: [17] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:50:00 PM
Page 2: [17] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:50:00 PM
Page 3: [18] Deleted	Carlson, Elizabeth Leigh	1/21/20 3:49:00 PM



Faculty Senate

**A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE APPROPRIATE REGULATION OF HONORS,
AWARDS, OR DISTINCTIONS BY UNITS OF THE UNIVERSITY (20/10)**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY**

That the language in the first point in the Guidelines for the Conferral of Honors, Awards, or Distinctions (as set out in Senate Resolution 04/09, attached) be clarified in the following way:

“The awardee must have achieved distinction in his or her profession. “Distinction” can be measured in a variety of ways: winning significant prizes for professional **contributions**, ~~or~~ scholarly work **or service to the community**; achieving national or international recognition for ~~professional~~ ~~or~~ scholarly or **professional work including service to the local or global community**; or displaying the kind of ~~professional or~~ scholarly **or professional skills** or abilities, character, and integrity that might cause the nominee to be considered ~~to be~~ a role model for students.

Honors and Academic Convocations Committee of the Faculty Senate
December 20, 2019

Adopted as amended by the Faculty Senate
February 14, 2020

A Resolution for the Appropriate Regulation of Honors, Awards, or Distinctions by Units of the University (04/9)

WHEREAS, it is of the first importance that any honor, award, or distinction linked with the name of The George Washington University continue to deserve the high regard of the entire academic community and the world at large; and

WHEREAS, it is essential therefore that such honors, awards, or distinctions be conferred with due deliberation on individuals or associations properly deserving of that honor, award, or distinction; and

WHEREAS, to that end it is desirable that in conferring such honors, awards, or distinctions on persons outside the community of GW students, faculty, and staff a degree of uniformity in standards, criteria, and deliberation be maintained throughout the University; **NOW, THEREFORE**

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

- 1) That, with respect to persons outside the community of students, faculty, and staff of The George Washington University, only Schools of the University should be authorized to confer honors, awards, or distinctions (that is, not individual Departments or other academic subdivisions, Institutes, or Centers, or other components, including 'schools within Schools', although these could well suggest or initiate consideration of such), subject to some appropriate procedures to be established by and within each School for that purpose, such procedures to be approved by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs; and
- 2) that nominations for such School honors, awards, or distinctions should be vetted and approved by the Committee on Honors and Academic Convocations of the Faculty Senate (the "Committee") on the basis of materials submitted in support of each honor to be conferred by the School and the guidelines set forth in the Appendix to this Resolution, much as that Committee now vets nominations for the award of honorary degrees submitted by the various Schools; provided, that awards of a more modest nature may be approved by the Committee on a generalized basis in accordance with such procedures as the Committee may determine to be appropriate, including the approval of standard criteria to be followed by a School in selecting recipients of such awards.

Appendix: Guidelines for Conferral of Honors, Awards, or Distinctions

- 1) The awardee must have achieved distinction in his or her profession. "Distinction" can be measured in a variety of ways: winning significant prizes for professional or scholarly work; achieving national or international recognition for professional or scholarly work; or displaying the kind of professional or scholarly skills or abilities, character, and integrity that might cause the nominee to be considered to be a role model for students.
- 2) The awardee must have made the kind of contribution to his or her profession that has measurably enhanced or improved the profession. The awardee must have set a new standard for

accomplishment, found new ways to deliver the benefits of the profession, or otherwise brought recognition to the profession.

3) A connection with GW and the School proposing the honor, award, or distinction would be an important positive factor.

Committee on Honors and Academic Convocations

Barry L. Berman, Acting Chair

March 22, 2005

Adopted, April 8, 2005



A RESOLUTION ON DIVERSITY

WHEREAS, the George Washington University is committed to being welcoming to all students, faculty, staff, and administration, regardless of their race, creed, sex, gender, sexual orientation, or religion;

WHEREAS, on February 7, 2018 President LeBlanc mandated that incoming students and some staff receive diversity training.¹

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- 1) That the university reaffirm its commitment to diversity and inclusion.
- 2) That the financial support of central administration for diversity in all regards, including Provost support of graduate diversity fellowships, not decline one iota below the levels of 2018-19.
- 3) That the University add a pillar on Diversity to its existing four pillar strategic plan (World Class Faculty; High Quality Undergraduate Education; Distinctive and Distinguished Graduate Education; High Impact Research).
- 4) That, the President appoint, with advice and consent of the of the Senate, a strategic planning committee to advise on university policies to implement this new Diversity Pillar.

Faculty Senate Libraries Committee
February 14, 2020

¹ <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/message-president-leblanc>



Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Nominating Committee (FSECNC) Slate

The FSECNC will convene to nominate the 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

CCAS: Bill Briscoe (chair)

ESIA: Hugh Agnew

GSEHD: Sylvia Marotta-Walters

GWSB: Art Wilson

GWSPH: Anne Markus

LAW: Alfreda Robinson

SEAS: Robert Harrington

SMHS: Gary Simon

SON: Christine Pintz

Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)

February 14, 2020

Sylvia A. Marotta-Walters, Chair

Shared Governance

Strategic Planning. Since the January meeting, the Strategic Planning Task Force met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC; February 4, 2020) to discuss the Interim Reports from the four Strategic Planning Pillar Committees. During the meeting, I reported on the unprecedented number of resolutions that had been passed by the Senate, all of which were designed to strengthen the faculty's role in strategic planning, and to be responsive to the petition passed at the Regular Assembly in October. Those resolutions can all be found on the Senate Website.

At the February 4th meeting, I also summarized the deliberations of the FSEC at their regular January 31st meeting, in response to the Interim Reports. We reviewed the content of each report and also considered whether there were any aspects of the reports that might be missing. One observation from the FSEC discussion is that the FSEC asked the Task Force to review and evaluate Vision 21, which is the strategic plan under which the university is currently operating, to determine what can be gleaned from that plan to inform this planning process. The FSEC commented on what was a curious omission from the Interim Reports, and that is the lack of mention from the High Quality Undergraduate Education Pillar (HQUE), any overt reference to the 20% reduction in the undergraduate enrollment over five years. This omission is in contrast to the many items in the HQUE referring to STEM initiatives and the move to 30% STEM studies. The FSEC also noted that the Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education Pillar report focused more on the PhD, and not particularly on professional doctorates. Finally, the FSEC asked the task force to consider ways to create bridges across the four Interim Reports, to ensure the incorporation of interdisciplinary and faculty-driven research activities mentioned in several of the committees' reports.

Board of Trustees' February Meeting. The Chair of the FSEC reported to the Committee on Academic Affairs and to the full Board on February 6, 7, 2020. The main focus of these reports was to engage with the Trustees on the issue of how the reduction in the undergraduate size, composition, and quality should have involved the faculty from its inception. Many lessons were learned as a result, both substantive and procedural.

On the substance, it is clear to the faculty that major changes in the size of the student body should involve participation by faculty prior to any final decisions having been made. Further, when there is a change in senior administrators tasked with enrollment management, extra care should be taken to ensure the same constructive and collaborative discussions with the Senate Committees that have characterized enrollment decisions in the past. Finally, when there are proposed changes in the discount rate, these should be done in consultation with the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee and the Education Policy and Technology Committee, each of which has substantial expertise in determining the effects of even one point reduction over the last decade.

On the procedural side, the Faculty Senate considers that it is impossible to predict what issues will surface in the future that would be of concern to the faculty. However, the faculty proposes that if there is an issue of sufficient concern to the Trustees that it warrants a study of an academic year or more, that a concurrent study be done with any of the relevant Senate committees charged with that issue. Further, when there are financial decisions that could significantly affect the quality of the educational experience, then detailed potential options, projections and accompanying data should be made available to the Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting for faculty input on the effects of such plans or proposals. Finally, that the Faculty Organization Plan (FOP) has some ambiguities on the role of the Faculty Assembly in relation to the Faculty Senate on issues of shared governance. There is also the possibility of a need to change the quorum for the assembly that has not been updated in decades in the FOP. This latter issue should be examined by the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom in consultation with the Senate Parliamentarian.

Faculty Role on Strategic Initiative on Culture.

Since the January meeting, the chair of the FSEC reported to the Board of Trustees on the continuing collaborative process among administrators, staff, and faculty, around implementation of the culture initiative. The Culture Leadership Team is actively working on assessment strategies to measure the effects of the university's activities over the last year, and on implementing further training in leadership development and specific ways to institutionalize the university's service framework.

Faculty Role on Strategic Initiative on Research.

The Senate Research Committee is actively engaged with the Strategic Planning Committee on High Impact Research, and their recommendations have been infused into that committee's work product. The second phase of the Research Ecosystem Assessment is almost complete and that report will be sent to the administration within the next month.

Faculty Personnel Matters

Grievances: There are no grievances at the university.

Calendar

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be on February 28, 2020. As is our custom, all agenda items for the FSEC should be submitted one week prior to the scheduled meeting.