



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
HELD ON JANUARY 10, 2020
AT 1957 E STREET NW/STATE ROOM**

Present: President LeBlanc; Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Deans Feuer, Goldman, and Lach; Interim Deans Bracey and Wahlbeck; Executive Committee Chair Marotta-Walters; Registrar Amundson; Professors Agnew, Briscoe, Brown, Cordes, Costello, Dugan, Gutman, Harrington, Johnson, Khilji, Lewis, McHugh, Mylonas, Orti, Perry, Pintz, Rain, Rao, Roddis, Schumann, Schwartz, Swaine, Tekleselassie, Tielsch, Wagner, Wilson, Wirtz, Yezer, and Zara.

Absent: Provost Blake; Deans Akman, Brigety, Jeffries, and Mehrotra; Interim Dean Deering; University Librarian Henry; Professors Cottrol, Eleftherianos, Gupta, Hill, Markus, Rehman, Sarkar, Sidawy, Subiaul, and Vonortas.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:16p.m. The President noted that Provost Blake is attending a semi-annual provost meeting and unable to join the Senate meeting today. The President also noted that he would need to leave the meeting at 3:25pm to take a critical phone call.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the December 13, 2019, Faculty Senate meeting were approved unanimously without comment.

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

Professor Orti introduced his resolution, commenting that he understands this is a difficult topic and thanking all who have provided feedback, insight, and advice to the resolution's authors. He noted that, as a new Senator, he has been very impressed by the dedication, passion, and commitment by all who are working on behalf of the Senate to make GW a better university. In a practical sense, the current resolution addresses item #1 of the petition passed by the Faculty Assembly in October. The resolution was submitted to the Senate's December meeting with the intent that it would help the Senate act and report on the issue of shared governance as instructed by the Assembly. He expressed his belief that all present are concerned with transparency and shared governance (noting that this was his personal motivation to run for the Senate) and that academia functions best when no-one is afraid to suggest new ways of doing things and when those in leadership listen to and consult with those below them, taking the time to explain intentions so that an organization can move forward with clear goals in mind. This process takes time but ensures a

better outcome; in contrast, top-down cultures are less creative, prone to error, and can result in unhappy environments where it is difficult to thrive. He noted his belief that GW's culture can be improved by reminding the faculty represented by the Senate as well as the broader GW community of the principles of shared governance.

The current resolution is meant to focus on the process of governance and less on substance related to the particulars of the strategic plan. Regardless of individual positions on the two supporting pillars of the plan (reducing undergraduate enrollment by 20% and increasing STEM majors to a 30% share, referred to hereafter in this document as the 20/30 plan), the resolution authors want to be sure faculty have access to the data to allow them to support this plan with confidence. The question brought to the floor today is related to process and the importance of shared governance as a path to shared goals. The issue at hand is whether the Senate had an opportunity to discuss the particulars of the 20/30 plan without foregone conclusions. Unfortunately, no such discussions took place before the 20/30 plan was announced by the President in September 2019.

The resolution's authors understand that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) and the Senate standing committee chairs are the conduits for such discussions. Those in these roles have thankless jobs, long hours, difficult decisions, and no compensation for this work. The only way they can be conduits for this type of information is with enough time to consult with faculty and bring forward faculty views in a way that can influence and shape decisions related to the pillars of the strategic plan.

Second, the Senate Appointment, Salary, & Promotion Policies (ASPP) committee noted this infringement on shared governance in their November 22, 2019, report, which stated, "GW did not properly follow the principles of shared governance as the 20% decrease came down from the Board of Trustees." The Senate Research Committees has also considered this issue and included a similar statement in a report earlier this week, and the Senate Educational Policy & Technology (EdPol) Committee discussed shared governance at its meeting this morning. In addition, faculty have not yet been asked their thoughts on the 20/30 plan underpinning the strategic planning process.

Professor Orti concluded his opening remarks by noting that the resolution is about more than what has occurred in the past. It provides an instrument for how to act going forward. As the President's culture survey confirmed, changing the top-down culture of the university is long overdue, and there is no better place than to begin this transformation than in the Senate. The resolution's authors sincerely hope that the Senators make it clear that critical decisions about the university's future cannot be made without meaningful faculty consultation. Only with this kind of work, going forward, can the university community be fully committed to future plans.

Due to the length of the December Faculty Senate meeting, the resolution was delayed until this meeting. Realizing that the constructive intent of the resolution was not always evident, the authors used this delay to make some minor modifications to the resolution; the revised resolution was shared with the FSEC on December 28 and with the full Senate membership earlier this week. Professor Orti requested and obtained unanimous consent to substitute a revised version of the resolution for that on the posted agenda.

Professor Brown noted that she appreciates the amended version of the resolution, as the removed whereas clauses seemed disrespectful to her. Considering the current version of the resolution, she questioned the accuracy of Whereas Clause (WC) 16 (noting that these models do exist) and the

feasibility of Resolving Clause (RC) 8 (noting that the plan has been vetted and endorsed by the Board of Trustees).

Professor Johnson noted that one thrust of the resolution is that the faculty hasn't been duly informed. He feels he has been given plenty of information on this issue and cited President LeBlanc's December Senate presentation as leaving him with the impression that the administration is aware of the complexity of this issue and the numerous moving parts that have to be put into place. As one Senator, he noted he is happy to have the administration implement this plan, which he believes will improve the quality of the undergraduate body at GW and make the university a more competitive institution. He also feels the faculty has had a great deal of input on this issue in recent months and is ready to have the Senate bless the incremental implementation of the 20/30 plan. He added that the current resolution includes many statements centering on faculty not being involved in this process, a position with which he disagrees completely.

Professor Gutman outlined three points, labeling them the problem, the response, and the solution. He associated himself with Professor Orti and all those who have and will laud the notion of faculty governance. His question is what this means in practice. He noted that the tenor of the resolution and much of the debate around it has centered on the idea that the presentation of the 20/30 plan has fallen outside of GW's historical custom, tradition, and norms of what faculty governance means. Acknowledging his relative lack of historical information on past admissions-related decisions, he noted that he is not yet convinced that the 20/30 plan falls outside GW's historical tradition (e.g., whether the Senate has taken votes on previous admissions policy changes). This raises a question for him as to which issues are subject to robust faculty governance. One metric might be the dollar value of the issue before the Senate; for example, the Thurston Hall renovation and the current legal issues related to the medical school probably both involve more dollars than the one currently before the Senate, but it is not obvious to him that these issues have undergone the same kind of review and data analysis by the Senate that the resolution's authors would prefer with regard to the 20/30 plan. This would seem to be a question of selective faculty governance: there are some issues the Senate would feel merit more involvement and others that merit less. He is not sure where his boundary lies but suggested that, wherever it lies, it should be made clear to this and future administrations which categories the Senate believes merit the most robust faculty governance so that current and future leaders won't transgress in this area. He then asked what involvement really means, drawing a parallel to the US Congress's current debate over involvement in a decision related to military activity. Involvement could conceivably include any or all of the following: notification, briefing, dialogue and input, or a vote.

Professor Gutman turned to his second point, which is that of the administration's response. He noted that, at the Assembly, he heard a very sensible request for the data underlying and a rationale for the 20/30 plan. His sense is that the President has provided a rationale and with at least some of the data supporting his view. Professor Gutman's two takeaways from this information-sharing is that the question around increasing STEM majors is less of a heavy lift than many initially thought and that the President and the Board Chair have both stated that enrollment changes going forward will not endanger diversity at GW. Professor Gutman asked what the next steps are, wondering if the Senate believes that there are more data that should be provided or that the data used are flawed or have been mis-analyzed. The answers to these questions will drive what the Senate does with the current resolution and this issue going forward.

Finally, Professor Gutman noted that there is uncertainty around the practical effect of a vote to stop a plan that the Board has approved and is being implemented. It would be concerning to see a very public story of a significant rift among the Board, the administration, and the Senate that could lead to the unfortunate and ironic side effect of reducing undergraduate enrollment for the wrong reasons. A better story would be one in which, going forward, all parties commit to a more collaborative partnership around major decisions such as the 20/30 plan. Recalling the President's statement that he reserves the right to be rational when implementing this plan, Professor Gutman noted his belief that all parties can agree on what it means to be rational; specifically, everyone involved in this decision wants students to have experience in a diverse student body whose numbers don't threaten GW's on-campus enrollment cap and to have their financial needs largely satisfied through generous financial aid packages. If this shared vision is jeopardized by the plan going forward, then all involved should take steps to convene and collaborate on resolving those concerns. This is prospective faculty governance; dwelling on past issues doesn't move the university forward.

Professor Wirtz expressed his view that everyone in the room is in agreement with what has been said thus far and is operating in the best interests of the university and its students. As a former EdPol chair, he stated that, at least in the relatively recent past, EdPol has been actively involved in the process around all major decisions involving admissions policy, including the decision to increase enrollment (and then recover from too steep an increase). He noted that the issue bringing the Senate to this point is the fact that, for the first time in his 35 years at GW, this wasn't the case; to the best of his knowledge, no-one on the faculty was involved in the 20/30 plan decision process. He noted that process is critical and trumps everything else in this matter; eliminating faculty consultation removes the very group (EdPol) involved with years of work with the administration on models and plans that would make a plan like this work and guarantee the strong future of the university. He noted that the pre-ordained 20% cut in undergraduate enrollment is problematic as both he and Professor Cordes (who can speak to his own analyses of this) have run numbers that raise concerns. The university must manage the limitations created by debt service, tenured faculty, and education costs that can't be cut in the interest of funding this plan. This is to say nothing of new initiatives requiring funding of their own (e.g., the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA) and the culture initiative). If the funding for the 20% enrollment cut could be clearly identified, and assuming the university is able to maintain diversity and student quality, all would be well.

He noted, however, that it is very difficult to see how this plan can be accomplished without the university taking a hit in the educational product provided by the university, which is the one area the faculty is most responsible for achieving. One way or another, the financial implications of the 20% cut will impact the university in an undesirable way, and this is why the debate on this issue is where it is at present. Professor Wirtz applauded the President's explanations of the history of the path to this point and how the university will proceed from here, but one area of concern remains the discount rate. GW has spent years marking the effects of a changing discount rate, which is the rate used to try and ensure that students' financial needs are met. Cutting this rate has many potential implications, including on diversity and on the academic quality of students. Reducing the degrees of freedom on these measures makes it more difficult to achieve a 20% reduction without major financial implications. Professor Wirtz added that one of GW's largest expenses is faculty. The university can cut back on adjunct and part-time faculty, but, at some point, this begins to impact the quality of the university's academic product. He noted that the Board's primary responsibility is fiduciary. Some group has to stand up for the quality of the university's product; the current resolution is attempting to state that the Senate represents that group. The Senate wants to

do all that the President wants to do but wants to work with the President and not be told after the fact about decisions impacting the academic product of the university. For this reason, Professor Wirtz supports the current resolution.

Professor Wagner responded to some prior remarks. She noted in response to Professor Gutman's comments that WC1 includes a strong statement (quoted from a joint directive issued by the American Association of University Professors [AAUP], the American Council on Education [ACE], and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges [AGB]) on the faculty's purview with regard to shared governance. She expressed that there is no way a 20% reduction in the undergraduate student body will not have an impact on measures critical to the diversity and academic quality of GW's undergraduate population. For this reason, a discussion is being invited.

In response to Professor Johnson's comments, Professor Wagner noted that the Senate has indeed had an opportunity in recent months to have a robust role in these deliberations. However, this is not the intent of the current resolution, which indicates that the principles of shared governance were not adhered to prior to Fall 2019 on these issues. Involvement occurred only after the 20/30 plan and the scope and direction of the strategic planning committees were set without faculty input. In that sense, she noted, the current resolution is about moving forward and identifying how the Senate can invite a more structured relationship going forward on shared governance around the critical issues noted in WC1.

Finally, Professor Wagner noted that she has yet to see a model that demonstrates that the 20/30 plan won't adversely affect diversity. She referenced presentations by Professor Cordes to the Senate and by former Provost Maltzman to EdPol that demonstrate a negative impact on diversity. She noted her continuing question around how GW will be stronger under this plan and how a model maintaining diversity levels will be funded. She indicated her strong support for the current resolution.

Professor Cordes indicated his support for the resolution but for slightly different reasons than have been expressed thus far. He noted that the 20/30 plan had a rocky start, but that adjustments were made during Fall 2019 to increase faculty involvement and the availability of data. His goal as the Senate Fiscal Planning & Budgeting (FPB) committee chair is to ensure information is available on what the likely effects of a plan like this are. He noted that there are tradeoffs that may be worthwhile but that his committee needs responses that are specific and detailed enough to be useful, including from the deans as relates to modeling being done at the school level. Professor Cordes continues to meet regularly with Executive Vice President and CFO Mark Diaz, but the information shared in those meetings frequently has the caveat of confidentiality. He noted that it would be helpful to share some limited pieces of this information. As regards the current resolution, Professor Cordes noted that he sees it as continuing the work begun by the Assembly and the Senate in Fall 2019.

Professor Schwartz reiterated Professor Wagner's highlight of WC1, noting that shared governance centers on issues related to education, curriculum, and admissions.

Professor Rao applauded Professor Orti for the courage and dedication with which he has approached this issue. As he sees it, the current resolution follows through from the October Faculty Assembly and the passions and concerns that were raised at that meeting. A great deal has

happened since then by way of information and analysis. The current resolution takes a few different angles: it outlines concerns about process, addresses the technical aspects of the 20/30 plan, and includes a third issue around what has taken place since the Assembly and what should happen going forward. He suggested that, in order to be most effective, the resolution should perhaps be primarily focused on the question of process moving forward, and he suggested some adjustments to better focus the resolution. Specifically, he suggested eliminating RC1 and RC8 to remove the more technical components of the resolution. Additional resolution(s) could then be brought forward to address these technical issues; a resolution blending all these issues is less useful.

Professor Mylonas noted his agreement with Professor Rao on this issue—that there is too much in this resolution (issues of history, present concerns, future actions, and process). He suggested making some small changes so that the resolution does not appear to be antagonizing the administration, noting that the current administration has heard the faculty’s message on this issue quite clearly but that precedents should be set on process to avoid an issue like this with future administrations. He noted that shared governance did work as a result of the Faculty Assembly, and much of what is outlined in the resolution is being done now. Recounting the past has been accomplished by the filing of the Faculty Senate and Assembly meeting minutes. Editing the current resolution would make it a better precedent setter for future work.

Professor Johnson asked, assuming the resolution is adopted, what effect it would have. Professor Orti responded that it would send a strong message to the Board. Professor Wirtz noted that there is a clear path for resolutions passed by the Senate. A passed resolution is sent to the administration, and the administration either concurs or non-concurs with the resolution and collaborates with the Board on it. The issue isn’t whether or not the resolution’s passage has a lasting effect on numbers. Rather, the issue is the Senate is going on record as stating this is what it feels needs to happen, and that action alone is the answer to Professor Johnson’s question. Professor Dugan added that the President’s presentation and the reports from the strategic planning committee chairs to the Senate in December were a result of the Assembly petition. The current resolution signals to faculty that their elected Senators will hear their concerns and represent them well.

Professor Marotta-Walters spoke in favor of the intent of the resolution but in total opposition to the resolution in its current form on language and procedural grounds. She noted that the resolution includes a mixture of WCs that are inflammatory to no specific purpose. She added that it is the Senate’s normal practice to have a resolution go to a Senate committee to be crafted in line with the committee’s purpose and then comes to the Senate floor for debate and vote. The FSEC deviated from that practice in this case as the resolution came up at a time that it was heavily involved in a heated response to the Assembly. She expressed her belief that the Senate needs to go on record that shared governance was violated in this case and offered a quote from the AAUP Statement on the Government of Colleges and Universities for inclusion in the resolution: “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 the governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.” She expressed that she did not want wordsmithing to take place on the floor of the Senate.

Professor Wagner stated that the Senate can and should wordsmith the current resolution now, amending it and coming to consensus, whether the resolution is ultimately approved or rejected.

Professor Yezer observed, as an economist, that there are two points of view. One is that the status quo is fine, and the other is that the proposed change is fine; his opinion is that both views are incorrect. He noted that, over the past seven years, GW's ranking has dropped from 52nd to 71st while competitors Georgetown and American have remained stable, the university has borrowed several hundred million dollars, and the discount rate and acceptance rates are much higher than nearby peer institutions. He cited a large parking garage on campus that has no building constructed over it, which is, from an economics perspective, "completely nuts." He expressed his opinion that the last seven years have been a disaster. He suggested that the problem isn't in interrupting the status quo; rather, the problem is that the status quo is no good.

Professor Cordes noted that the current issue is not without precedent, recalling that the Science and Engineering Hall consultation was fraught with a lot of debate. The cost estimates for the building ultimately came from FPB, not from the administration. Professor Cordes expressed his support for the current discussion, which is supported by the principles in the current resolution.

Professor Costello noted that she fully supports transparency and shared governance. The question is how to pass a resolution with which the majority of senators will feel comfortable. She suggested that the current resolution be referred to a Senate committee to clean up its language, noting that too many authors on the floor of the Senate run the risk of drafting a poorly-written final product. She moved to refer the resolution to a Senate committee (the motion was seconded). Professor Marotta-Walters suggested that EdPol would be the right committee to which to refer the resolution, and the motion was clarified to include EdPol as the referring committee. Professor Zara responded that EdPol met this morning and discussed the current resolution, concluding that the governance issue is larger than the scope of the committee and would be better handled at the Senate level. Professor Wirtz suggested that the Senate Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) committee is better suited to this. He noted that EdPol is better for the substantive issue, but the procedural issues would be better handled in PEAf.

Professor Perry summarized the key messages expressed thus far that should be documented and codified. One is of shared governance as principle, and another is of shared governance as process. The resolution should also acknowledge the amount of engagement and the robust response from the administration that has occurred since the Faculty Assembly. She asked what the resolution means when it requires "vigorous action going forward" and suggested that the Senate should not become mired in the process and unable to act if indeed the status quo is unacceptable and requires action to change.

Professor Costello amended her motion and moved to refer the current resolution to PEAf; the motion was seconded. Debate began on the motion.

Professor Mylonas asked whether the resolution would be referred with a specific charge for edits; he expressed uncertainty as to the group's consensus on a charge to the committee.

Professor Wagner pointed out that there is a Senate special committee report due to the FSEC on February 3 as well as a Special Faculty Assembly to be held at the end of February. She stated that, if the Senate cannot respond to petition item #1, which undergirds the entire petition, it will be highly problematic for the Senate as well as the administration to come before the Assembly. She recommended that the Senate proceed through each element of the current resolution and, by show of hands, determine where the areas of concern are in the resolution. If this process results in the

process becoming mired in questions of language, then the resolution can be referred to committee. She concurred with Professor Dugan's point that the Senate has a responsibility to its constituents on the faculty.

Professor Swaine spoke in his capacity as chair of PEAFF. He reiterated his earlier statement (made in previous Senate meetings) that large parts of this initiative fall outside of PEAFF's scope. He noted that the issue of faculty governance is split among the committees and the Senate as a whole (drawing the analogy of the horcrux of *Harry Potter* fame); it doesn't fall to the special competence of a single committee, particularly of PEAFF. Moreover, he noted, this is a different circumstance than usual in that the committee would be charged with reacting to and pruning a document that began with authors outside the committee. He suggested that the Senate establish a drafting committee for the purpose set forth in Professor Costello's motion. Such a committee could draw upon members of the Senate who can speak to the substance of the existing resolution, including the resolution's authors. Professor Marotta-Walters agreed, adding the committee would be able to clean up what would be difficult to accomplish on the Senate floor, given the sheer number of WCs in the resolution. She added that she did not think addressing the first point in the Assembly petition would depend upon the current resolution, as the December and January Senate meeting minutes will provide a great deal of detail from which one can draw the intent of the faculty on these matters. She assured Professor Wagner that there would be substantial information available to allow the special committee to draft its report and further indicated her willingness to assist in drafting a revised version of the current resolution.

Professor McHugh asked what this motion might mean for the timeline, indicating his concern over further delay. He suggested that it might be time well spent in discussion now to determine which points are nonstarters for the Senate as a whole to avoid sending the document for revision by a committee that might not address everyone's points of concern. He asked what implication a delay in the current resolution might have.

Professor Rao asked whether the resolution's authors would be willing to delete RC1 and RC8 and to add the proposed quote read by Professor Marotta-Walters. Professor Orti indicated that he would be willing to delete RC8 and add the quote but not to delete RC1.

President LeBlanc noted, prior to departing the meeting, that he appreciates both the civility and the substance of the current discussion. He was particularly struck by Professor Gutman's analysis of what is shared governance and when is it applicable. He stated that he has a history of shared governance in his career (receiving an award from the Faculty Senate at his prior institution for his work on shared governance) but noted that he makes mistakes, and different institutions have different notions of shared governance. The President noted that one brings one's history and experience to a place and learns as one goes along. He expressed no ill intent in any of this debate, and he appreciates that everyone is speaking in the best interests of the institution. He indicated that he understands where this debate is coming from; learning from this experience will help all work better together going forward. He reiterated that there was never any intent to deceive, hide, or exclude. The concerns expressed about financing, diversity, and student quality are all fair points. None of these elements was dictated by the Board. As noted at the December Senate meeting, the Provost has created a committee (including three representatives nominated by the Senate) to discuss how to implement and monitor the 20/30 plan. Models run now are not created for the fifth year of the plan but rather for the first; the university is confident it can attain the numbers in the first-year model. First-year lessons and performance will then drive adjustments to the second year's

model, and so forth. He noted that this will be an annual learning process with adjustments along the way. He reminded the Senate that a 20% reduction in undergraduate enrollment is not a 20% reduction in budget; these two elements are not related. The \$64-68 million gap represents about 5% of the total university budget. He closed by stating that, whatever the Senate decides today, he respects the debate and the individuals contributing to it, and he intends to do all he can to work with the Senate and the broader faculty going forward to improve the institution along this strategic path.

The President turned the meeting gavel over to Professor Marotta-Walters upon his departure.

Professor Yezer made the point that, in the first year, the plan raises the cost of attending GW by 7.6% and cutting student enrollment by 5%. Fiscally, this is a plan which, in the first year, has little fiscal effect. He indicated that if the Senate wants to communicate to the Board about this plan, it is necessary to differentiate between what it does in the first year and what it would be doing by the fourth year. Fiscally responsible statements are required to maneuver a plan like this through the Board successfully.

Professor Schwartz asked Professor Rao to clarify his objection to RC1, noting that this clause simply states that shared governance was not adhered to, which seems to be an accepted point in the Senate. Professor Rao responded that his concern is with the use of the present tense (“violates”), which brings the issue into the present and doesn’t describe it as a past occurrence. Keeping the present tense would imply an ongoing issue that would prevent the 20/30 plan from proceeding, which is not, as Professor Rao understands it, Professor Orti’s intent. Professor Briscoe suggested replacing “violates” with “was inconsistent with” to address this concern.

Professor Costello acknowledged that this dialogue is important but noted that if she were editing this document on her own to capture the flavor of the present discussion, she would shorten it substantially to a much simpler resolution. She expressed that line-by-line deliberation across so many clauses loses the intended spirit of the resolution in its length. She reiterated her opinion that the resolution needs to be rewritten, whether done on the floor of the Senate or as part of a smaller drafting committee. Such a rewrite requires time to be done well. Professor Orti expressed that he would prefer not to send the resolution to a committee.

Professor Roddis concurred with Professor Perry’s earlier statement, noting that the current resolution is trying to do a great many things. Some of those things actually belong in the special committee’s report to the Assembly (for example, petition item #1 has already been reported from at least one Senate committee). The Senate’s discussions of these matters, both on the Senate floor and within its committees, address the petition’s first item. She expressed that mixing different objectives in a single resolution is problematic, and she suggested dividing the current resolution to simplify what is contained within it. She expressed that both the resolution authors and the FSEC experienced a lack of communication that might have led to a stronger, simpler resolution had it followed the typical Senate procedure and been referred to a Senate committee. She expressed her appreciation for the current discussion and recognized the President’s work to correct the error in process that occurred when the 20/30 plan was introduced last summer. Given that the timeline issues are being met by the committees’ reports, the current resolution is not required to meet a calendar date. It would be better to have one or more clear resolutions rather than try to push this through today. While well meaning, the current resolution as written doesn’t accomplish its stated goals.

Professor Tekleselassie noted that the President stated he would follow a rational process during implementation of the plan. This entails making adjustments to the plan if the data suggest any unintended outcomes to GW's financial health or to its commitment to excellence and diversity. He indicated that he would like this language to be included in the resolution.

Professor Swaine reiterated his earlier point that the current resolution doesn't fall within the special competence of PEAFF. It touches on matters related to PEAFF's scope but on other things as well. He asked that the Senate realistically understand what the current motion is contemplating: specifically, it brings to the attention of a committee not focused on these matters in particular, a set of issues that have to do with a number of historical elements. This body would naturally establish a drafting subcommittee of some form to handle this. He suggested that it would be better to involve a cross-section of the Senate, including the resolution's authors and other proponents; this would be a sounder and more efficient process. It is also possible that the Senate as a body could give a better set of instructions to whatever committee is charged with revising the current resolution. For example, he noted he could easily see tweaking the current document and forming it into a set of principles, leaving statements of history and indictments of past process to the report expected at the beginning of February. Changing the word "violates" in RC1 to "implicates" turns the clause into a statement of principle, leaving only RC8 as an indictment of past process. Sending the resolution to a particular Senate committee for revision at this juncture would be bringing the process too far toward square one.

Professor Costello noted that she would accept an amendment to her motion to create a drafting committee composed perhaps of the chairs of the Senate standing committees as well as the original resolution authors. The motion was seconded. Professor Khilji asked whether sending the resolution to a drafting committee means that the resolution will return to the Senate floor; the response was affirmative. Professor Orti asked whether a revised resolution could be returned in time for the February Senate meeting. Professor Marotta-Walters responded that the revised resolution would need to be completed by January 31 in order to be included on the February 14 Senate agenda.

Professor Wagner asked whether the special committee's February 3 report could then be amended to include the Senate's response to an amended resolution 20/9. Otherwise, she noted, she is not certain how to take this action back to the Assembly in the special committee's report. Parliamentarian Charnovitz responded that the current resolution could be remanded to the existing special committee or to a new committee along the lines just proposed. A revision due date of January 31 could then be set for that committee to ensure that the revised resolution will be included on the February Senate agenda.

Professor Zara asked whether another committee is required for this or if it would be sufficient to return the resolution to its original authors for further work. He expressed his concern over having a committee apart from the resolution's authors revise a resolution they did not write.

Professor Schumann noted that a recurring theme in the discussion of the current resolution is that there are some aspects of the documents that could be cleaned up from a procedural perspective so that it reads more like other resolutions that have come before the Senate. She suggested that the original authors might need some guidance in revising the document along the line suggested at today's meeting, perhaps from the FSEC chair or other members of the FSEC; this would prevent another group from having to start over on this.

Professor McHugh stated he would like to hear where the current issues are with the resolution rather than remanding it to a committee who will not have adequate information about the Senate's concerns with the resolution. Professor Orti provided the following summary of suggested edits received thus far:

- A concern about the accuracy of WC16's statement regarding the availability of budget models;
- an objection to the word "violates" in RC1;
- an addition of the AAUP quote read earlier by Professor Marotta-Walters; and
- an objection to RC8 in its entirety.

He suggested the Senate take time now to consider additional amendments.

Professor Costello reiterated her earlier point that she would simplify the resolution in its entirety, editing it to a single WC and RC on principle and eliminate the rehashing of past history. She agreed that the statements defining shared governance and transparency are important and should be left in place, followed by a single RC. She noted that this is her idea of how best to proceed, but others will have different ideas, and, given the length of the current resolution, a separate drafting committee seems more appropriate in order to create a forward-looking resolution that is more positive in its tone.

Professor Wagner noted that the point of the resolution is establishing a record; the WCs establish the transpired events that lead to the RCs. Without those, there is no logical basis for the RCs. Professor Costello responded that all of the historical issues are well documented in the Senate's meeting minutes; she expressed her opinion that a group this size won't come to enough consensus to rewrite the document during this meeting. Professor Mylonas suggested that one solution might be to bring many of the historical WCs into the special committee report, leaving one basic WC to cover the history. The RCs can be amended as discussed already.

Parliamentarian Charnovitz noted that, on the floor presently, there is an underlying resolution, a motion to refer to committee, and an amendment to that motion. The Senate can continue to debate the amendment to the motion, but it cannot at this point introduce a new amendment to the motion. The Senate would vote on the amendment and then on the motion. If the motion to refer passes, the meeting would proceed to the next agenda item. If the motion to refer fails, debate would continue on the current resolution; that debate would proceed paragraph by paragraph, beginning with the RCs (all of which are amendable to two degrees) and then the WCs and the title (also amendable to two degrees).

A motion to close debate on the amendment to the motion was proposed and seconded. The motion passed by voice vote. A vote on the amendment to the motion to refer the resolution to a special drafting committee rather than to PEAFF passed the majority requirement. A vote to close debate on the amended motion passed the required two-thirds majority. A vote on the amended motion to refer Resolution 20/9 to a special drafting committee (to be elected after passage of the motion) failed to achieve a simple majority.

Debate continued on Resolution 20/9, beginning with the RCs.

Resolving Clause 1:

Professor Wirtz moved to change the word “violates” to “violated.” The motion was seconded. Professor Swaine recommended the use of as much consensus language as possible and suggested the word “implicates” instead, which establishes the principle of the issue rather than restating the history of the matter, noting that the special committee’s report will establish the history of the matter at hand. Professor Orti suggested Professor Briscoe’s suggestion to amend this word to the phrase “were inconsistent with,” and this amendment was accepted by Professor Wirtz.

Professor Gutman asked whether the WCs, which provide the factual bases for the RCs, should be reviewed first. Parliamentarian Charnovitz clarified that the Senate’s practice, consistent with Robert’s Rules of Order, is to consider the important part of the resolution—the RCs—first and then return to the WCs, which are not required as part of a resolution. He noted that the Senate could change this practice by a two-thirds vote. Professor Gutman noted that the WCs provide a basis for understanding what the RC votes mean in the context of the full resolution and that he may abstain from voting on amendments to the RCs given that the WCs stand unchanged at present.

Professor Costello raised a point of clarification, asking how the Senate should handle deleting or combining clauses. Parliamentarian Charnovitz responded that this may be done on a point by point basis, even following an amendment to edit the clause under discussion.

Professor Swaine noted an issue in establishing a factual RC before reporting the underlying basis in a WC, hence his suggestion of the word “implicates” rather than “were inconsistent with.” The latter is a factual proposition that cannot be supported without an approved WC.

A motion to close debate was made, seconded, and passed the two-thirds majority requirement. A vote on the amendment passed the simple majority requirement.

Professor Yezer moved to amend RC1 by removing the first word “That” and replacing it with “The process of...” and the subsequent verb “was” to “were.” The motion was seconded. Professor Marotta-Walters spoke against the amendment as it remains focused on the past. A vote on the amendment passed the simple majority requirement.

Professor Costello moved to delete RC1; the motion was seconded. Professor Roddis noted that this RC is actually a statement of fact and not a resolution statement; it should instead be a WC. Professor Swaine noted that RC1 can avoid statements of factual findings by using the word “implicates” instead of the original language. Professor Wilson asked whether RC1 can be converted to a WC, given that it is a statement of fact. Parliamentarian Charnovitz responded that the clause purports to be a statement of policy, relating to what shared governance is, but that this is a close call and Professor Wilson’s point is taken. A motion to close debate on the motion to delete RC1 was made, seconded, and passed the two-thirds majority requirement. A vote on the amendment failed the simple majority requirement.

A motion to close debate on RC1 was made, seconded, and passed the two-thirds majority requirement. A vote on the amended RC1 passed the simple majority requirement.

Resolving Clause 2:

Professor Gutman moved to delete RC2 in its entirety; the motion was seconded. Professor Wilson commented that RC2 defines this issue and opposed deleting it. Professors Mylonas and Tielsch both noted that RC2 is redundant to the WCs as written. A motion to close debate on the motion was made, seconded, and passed the two-thirds majority requirement. A vote on the motion to delete RC2 passed the simple majority requirement.

Resolving Clause 3:

Professor Tielsch moved to delete RC3 in its entirety; the motion was seconded. Professor Swaine spoke in favor of deleting RC3 as RC4 accomplishes the same thing by referring to the Senate as a whole. Professor Marotta-Walters spoke in favor of the motion, noting that passage of RC3 would emasculate the FSEC. (The Parliamentarian noted that the Senate does not need to move to close debate; it would be more efficient to cease debate when no further points are waiting to be made.) No further debate occurred, and a vote on the motion to delete RC3 passed the simple majority requirement.

Resolving Clause 4:

Professor Wilson moved to amend the language in RC4, replacing “by Senate Committees other than the Executive Committee, by faculty other than the Chair of the Senate Executive Committee” with “and by all relevant Senate committees.” The motion was seconded. Professor Swaine suggested including “in addition to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee” so as not to exclude the FSEC from this statement. Professor Tielsch commented that he doesn’t understand what “oversight” means in this setting and why this would apply only in cases of strategic planning. He additionally noted that he did not see the usefulness of the final clause of this RC related to strategic planning, given that the Senate is representative of the faculty. Professor Orti responded that the language in this RC comes from the procedural rules followed by the university. Professor Tielsch noted that his question on the term “oversight” is addressed in WC1. A vote on the motion to amend RC4 as described passed the simple majority requirement.

Professor Tielsch moved to end RC4 after “and by all relevant Senate committees.” The motion was seconded. Professor Wagner noted that this language is designed to ensure faculty engagement on major issues going forward. Professor Tielsch asked why this applies only to strategic planning and asked what the boundary of “major initiatives” is. Professor Wagner referred this to WC1. Professor Swaine noted that this clause purports to state what shared governance requires as minimum conditions but not necessarily as sufficient conditions. He expressed that he is less concerned about accidentally excluding other bodies (e.g., the Faculty Assembly and its role as established by other organizational rules) than he is about the administration engaging in exhaustive consultation with the Senate and its committees on matters and then the Senate’s hands being tied by a requirement to obtain Assembly input. He noted that this seems to be a reach beyond what university rules require, and he is hesitant to endorse this language. Professor Wilson pointed out that the Faculty Assembly can always raise a concern as it deems necessary; the Senate does not need to take a position on this practice. Professor Marotta-Walters noted that the Faculty Organization Plan (FOP) already specifies what the Assembly can and cannot do at any given time. She expressed her view that the language proposed for deletion is redundant and unnecessary. Professor Wirtz spoke in favor of the amendment and concurred with Professor Swaine, noting that this RC as written would bind the Assembly to speak on issues of strategic planning. Endorsing this language would require the Senate to involve the Assembly in cases related to strategic planning, which sets a terrible precedent. A vote on the motion to further amend RC4 as described passed the simple majority requirement.

Resolving Clause 5:

Professor Marotta-Walters noted that the direction laid out in RC5 is already enshrined in the official strategic planning timeline. Professor Tielsch moved to delete RC5 in its entirety as it is redundant; the motion was seconded.

Professor Wilson wondered if there might be a useful way to combine the two groups of people studying the same issues rather than argue about how and when they communicate with each other. He suggested that RC5 might be better worded to state that, for their duration, the strategic planning committees are deliberating with the relevant Senate committees. Professor Marotta-Walters noted that the four strategic planning committees have nearly concluded their work and that the Senate's special committee is halfway through its work. At this point, she noted, it would be difficult to combine the committees in a meaningful way.

Professor Wirtz noted that he believes that what promoted RC5 was the fact that EdPol was not involved in discussion of the issues around potential enrollment changes. The problem here is that the linkage specifically joining these Senate committees with the strategic planning committees turns this into an immediate-present issue, when it was not intended to be such. Professor Orti responded that RC5 was written before the information-sharing processes were established; as these processes have now been clearly set out, he would support removing this clause. He further indicated that there is significant overlap in the membership of strategic planning and Senate committees, rendering RC5 unnecessary.

No further debate occurred, and a vote on the motion to delete RC5 passed the simple majority requirement.

Resolving Clause 6:

Professor Tielsch moved to delete RC6 in its entirety; the motion was seconded. Professor Schwartz commented that the existence of this clause would seem to depend on the WCs, which raises the issue again of not yet having debated the WCs for the current resolution. He noted that the RC6 was meant to follow up on WC15, which refers to the President's commitment to maintaining diversity levels through the implementation of the 20/30 plan.

Professor Tielsch commented that he doesn't see a purpose to including this clause, which praises the President for sustaining a core value of the university. Professor Orti stated that the drafters' intent was to reinforce their view that they did not want to see diversity impacted negatively. Professor Tielsch responded that RC7 accomplishes that statement more effectively. Professor Tekleselassie suggested that RC6 reaffirms the President's commitment and that no harm comes from including it. Professor Tielsch found it silly to congratulate the President on every decision he makes that the Senate happens to agree with; he asked why RC6 only refers to the President and not also to Board of Trustees Chair Speights, who came before the Senate and committed herself to the same position on diversity. Professor Marotta-Walters noted that diversity is also one of the core values of the university.

Professor Costello spoke in favor of deletion of RC6, noting that in the same way the resolution is being amended to eliminate some of the more inflammatory clauses, it can be amended to eliminate statements on the other end of the spectrum.

Professor Wirtz suggested that the intent of this revised resolution was to make its language more pleasant and less strident; RC6 is a clause that reflects the collaborative intent of the Senate. While he understands that this would appear not to be necessary, he feels that RC6 speaks to the issue of tone. In that context, he would oppose the deletion.

Professor Gutman noted that, if the goal of the overall resolution is to reinforce the Senate's commitment to shared governance, then questions of diversity are a separate matter. Professor Wagner understood this point entirely but stated her belief that this is a critical issue for the university. She noted that she sees RC6 and RC7 as linked, with the former acknowledging the President and the latter acknowledging the Senate's role on maintaining diversity. She expressed her hope that the Senate can take this opportunity to firmly stand behind the commitment the President has made in this area.

No further debate occurred, and a vote on the motion to delete RC6 failed the simple majority requirement.

Professor McHugh moved to amend the language of RC6 to replace "President LeBlanc's" with "the administration's and the Board of Trustees;" the motion was seconded. Professor Brown noted that diversity is part of the mission of the university, and this clause simply applauds the leadership for doing what it is meant to be doing in support of that mission. Professor Wirtz responded that, when discussing a 20% enrollment cut, it is necessary to also talk about ways in which that cut will be manifest. There are comparatively few degrees of freedom in that discussion. One way is to reduce the discount rate, which automatically has an implication for reducing diversity. What RC6 seems to be trying to say is that diversity is not one of the elements the university should choose to sacrifice in order to achieve the 20% cut in enrollment. Professor Wirtz added that he would have also included the admittedly separate issue of academic quality, but he noted that he does not believe it is a foregone conclusion that reducing undergraduate enrollment by 20% doesn't naturally mean there will not be a reduction in diversity. What RC6 therefore does is to appreciate the fact that the way the cut will be addressed is not by zeroing in on diversity.

Professor Tielsch asked whether RC7 says the same thing and adds the academic quality piece as well. Professor Wirtz responded that he thinks the major change between the first and the current versions of this resolution is a much more positive tone in the current version, noting that praise should be given when due. Professor Cordes reminded the Senate that, before Chair Speights spoke to the Senate last fall and made a public commitment to maintaining diversity, there was some serious consideration given to scaling back the discount rate as a method of funding the lost tuition revenue. That plan is no longer on the table, which Professor Cordes sees as a good thing. RC6 serves to remind the leadership of the importance of this commitment. Professor Tielsch responded that he finds RC6 redundant to RC7, which makes a much more powerful statement.

Professor Schwartz suggested the Senate focus on the proposed amendment as the motion to delete RC6 has already failed.

Professor Gutman noted that he is fully in support of the issue raised in RC6 and RC7 and reluctantly asked whether RC7 has been reviewed by GW's legal counsel for legal sufficiency. He stated that it is not clear to him whether it is proper to state that the university's goal is to increase diversity and whether that statement has any legal implications. Professor Wirtz raised a point of order to suggest that the debate return to RC6. Parliamentarian Charnovitz noted that the issue of

the legality of the resolution is germane to the current debate. Professor Marotta-Walters added that the District of Columbia specifically names diversity variables, and those do not match the ones listed in RC7. Professor Swaine suggested that, in his view, the Senate merely calling on the university to do something carries no legal significance.

No further debate occurred, and a vote on the motion to amend RC6 as described above passed the simple majority requirement. A vote on RC6 as amended passed the simple majority requirement.

Resolving Clause 7:

Professor Tielsch moved to amend RC7 by replacing “such as” with “including but not limited to;” the motion was seconded. Professor Wirtz asked how this changes the original language, as “such as” holds the same meaning. Professor Tielsch responded that he wants the resolution to be clear that there is no intent to leave out other variables of diversity, particularly those that might be on the District of Columbia’s classification list but not on this list. Professor Khilji commented that RC7 speaks not only to diversity but also to inclusion and suggested the addition of “and to ensure inclusion.” This was determined by the Parliamentarian not to be germane to the current amendment under debate; he noted that it could be raised following the vote on the current amendment.

Professor Dugan proposed amending “sex and gender” to “sexual orientation and gender expression.” The Parliamentarian found the amendment to be germane to the current debate, and the amendment was seconded.

Professor Marotta-Walters noted her discomfort with the current wordsmithing of this clause, suggesting that, while it may not have legal standing, it could place GW in a negative light in the media. Professor Swaine suggested that it would be easier and consistent with the tone of the amended RC6 to relate to diversity (or diversity and inclusion) without the addition of variables. Professor Dugan and Professor Tielsch withdrew their respective motions.

Professor Yezer moved to replace “expand” with “develop plans that raise” in order to focus on the planning process rather than outcomes; the motion was seconded. Professor Marotta-Walters offered a friendly amendment to delete all specific diversity variables from RC7, so that the phrase would read “develop plans that raise academic excellence with respect to diversity and inclusion.” Professor Zara stated that he felt that “to maintain or increase diversity” should be retained in the clause. Professor Wilson noted that diversity and academic excellence are two separate things; both should be expressed if they are both intended. Professor Zara suggested amending this wording to read “develop plans that raise academic excellence, and that maintain or increase diversity and inclusion.”

Professor Wilson asked for clarification on what is meant by the term “inclusion.” Professor Marotta-Walters responded that it refers to an environment that fosters a sense of belonging among a diverse population. Professor Schwartz suggested that inclusion should be more than maintained and proposed amending the wording of this amendment to “develop plans that raise academic excellence, that maintain or increase diversity, and that expand inclusion.” This sends a message that the status quo on inclusion is not an acceptable aspiration. Professor Marotta-Walters requested unanimous consent to amend her amendment as suggested by Professor Schwartz.

No further debate occurred, and a vote on the motion to amend RC7 as described immediately above passed the simple majority requirement. A vote on RC7 as amended passed the simple majority requirement.

Resolving Clause 8:

Professor Schwartz moved that, given the alterations already made and the consensus around the spirit of the resolution as objecting to how this matter was handled and going on the record as to how similar matters should be handled going forward, RC8 be deleted in its entirety. The motion was seconded. Professor Wirtz spoke against the motion, noting that he would like the Senate to go on record with regard to the particular plans that have been implemented without discussion with the faculty. RC8 gets at the point behind the current resolution—that there was an announcement of an enrollment cut without any real attention to how that will affect the educational objectives of the faculty. RC8 puts the Senate firmly on record as objecting not only to the process but to the result of that process. While he harbors no illusions about the administration proceeding with this plan regardless, he would like the Senate to take the high road on this issue and go on record as stating that this plan is a bad idea.

Professor Orti confirmed that this was exactly the spirit of RC8, which is the logical consequence of RC1, which states that the adoption and implementation of this plan was not consistent with the principles of shared governance.

Professor Gutman noted that, in lieu of striking RC8, the Senate might express the view that it expects the administration to adhere to the foregoing principles of shared governance when implementing the plans approved by the Board of Trustees. This statement would put the Senate on a firm footing of shared governance, collaboration, and partnership going forward without unnecessarily creating what might be a significant downside. Professor McHugh suggested that another alternate might be to delete items a) and b) in RC8 while keeping item c).

Professor Marotta-Walters spoke in support of the motion to delete RC8, noting that it is one of the most inflammatory statements in the resolution and, in addition, focuses on the past. She indicated that she could support language such as that suggested by Professor Gutman, but she felt this clause would diminish the standing of the faculty as a whole in the eyes of the Board of Trustees.

Professor Wirtz understood Professor Marotta-Walters's point and stated that, ordinarily, he would be in total agreement on this point. However, he is looking forward a few years to what the implications he is almost positive will be on the composition of GW's student body and the university's ability to deliver a quality product. For him, it is important that the Senate be in a position to say that, while this plan occurred on its watch, it was not in agreement with it. Otherwise, in a sense, the Senate will be perceived as being culpable. RC8 distances the Senate from what Professor Wirtz believes are the likely outcomes of the 20% enrollment cut.

Professor Wilson noted that this plan is already in process and, to the extent that the Senate did not agree to it, any effort to express that should apply to what happens next, for example in years two, three, four, and five of the plan; it is too late to take this position on the first year of the plan. Professor Marotta-Walters noted that the remaining part of the plan is being worked on with faculty; three faculty members are sitting on the Provost's committee working to define the plan's algorithms. The faculty has not been excluded from this key implementation piece.

Professor Wirtz responded that he understood the President's pledge to reserve the "right to be rational" but noted that this pledge does not back away from a commitment to a 20% enrollment cut. In a sense, therefore, the Provost's committee is stuck with the plan under tight implementation constraints. RC8 allows the Senate to say that the university should start over and that it cannot do this 20% cut without taking a real hit in areas that are very important to the faculty. He noted that the way the cut is achieved in the first year is on the backs of the transfer students GW is able to accommodate in the current year; this is not sustainable, and the Senate should be on record as stating that this is not a good idea and that the university should stop the current plan and rethink where it is going.

Professor Dugan spoke against the motion to delete in her capacity as chair of the Senate Libraries committee. She noted that item a) is particularly important as she has not yet seen any scaffolding in the library budget to support an increase in STEM majors. She is concerned, given the expected reduction in tuition dollars, about how the libraries will be impacted.

Professor Cordes supported Professor Wirtz's point. He recalled the question he asked President LeBlanc at the December Senate meeting regarding the need for larger reductions in subsequent plan years to accommodate a smaller reduction in the first year of the plan. He noted that the President did not say no and in fact conceded the point in another part of the meeting.

Professor McHugh reiterated that item c) captures all the issues raised by the previous items and suggested that it be retained while deleting items a) and b).

Professor Yezer described three legs to the stool: fiscal, academic quality, and diversity. These are all linked together, and he suggested adding "academic quality" back into item b). He noted that there is an ongoing problem with plans being presented to the Senate that are fiscally wrong. He recalled having grave concerns about the financial plan behind the Science & Engineering Hall. He stated that there is an assumption that GW can raise the cost of attendance by 7.5% instead of by 3% for five years and experience no consequences for the institution. The Senate needs to point out that the devil is in the details, and the rosy scenario being presented is not going to come to pass; these details need to be laid out in this clause.

Professor Zara agreed with Professor Wilson, noting that having a statement asking the university not to implement a plan that has already been implemented is like asking an airplane already in the air not to take off. This plan is underway, and Admissions has their marching orders. He suggested reframing RC8 to state that, going forward, the Senate expects a certain level of engagement on issues like this. Professor Cordes supported the intent of this statement but noted that there are a lot of divergent paths the administration could take in implementing this plan. If the information is not shared, then the Senate will hear about reductions and implications after the fact. Professor Zara responded that the Senate should be asking the administration to provide it with its plans and the data behind those plans and place the Senate in the discourse going forward.

Professor Wilson suggested that the resolution to this issue is deciding whether this is a five-year plan or five one-year plans. If the former, it is already underway. If the latter, the Senate can say that it needs to be involved for years two through five. Professor Cordes supposed that the plan is not a fully articulated five-year plan but rather a five-year goal, with the coming year being the first incremental attempt at implementation.

No further debate occurred, and a vote on the motion to delete RC8 failed the simple majority requirement.

Professor Yezer moved to amend RC8 as follows: “The Senate asks the administration to refrain from implementing plans to reduce enrollment and increase STEM until after a) the financial implications of these plans are validated, 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.” Professor Wirtz asked for a friendly amendment to add “by the Senate” after “validated” in order to operationalize the term. The motion was seconded. Professor Wilson suggested simply saying “accepted by the Senate” rather than “validated” as he is not certain what that terms means in this context. Professor Yezer responded that validation in this case would follow professional standards for validating models.

Professor Gutman noted that he does not see much difference between the amendment and the current version. He spoke against the amendment and suggested an alternative, understanding that there is a current motion on the table, which reads “The Senate directs the administration to comply with the established principles of shared governance as it implements the plan referred to in Whereas clause x.” Parliamentarian Charnovitz indicated that this could be a germane, second-degree amendment to the motion on the floor. He noted that, should Professor Yezer’s amendment pass, Professor Gutman’s amendment could not be considered. It could be added as an additional RC, however. Professor Gutman indicated he would not want to see both an amended RC8 with Professor Yezer’s new language as well as a new RC9 with his language. He would like the Senate to consider his alternative wording to that proposed by Professor Yezer. Professor Gutman formally moved that his language be offered as an amendment to Professor Yezer’s motion; the motion was seconded.

Professor Swaine spoke in favor of Professor Gutman’s amendment. He expressed that there may be a technical understanding of terms like “validation” but that it is never administered through collegial bodies such as this one, and he does not understand, practically speaking, how it would work. He expressed his support for the simpler language in Professor Gutman’s amendment.

Professor Cordes suggested “review” in place of “validation” to retain the intent that the Senate have access to models and the data behind them. Professor Yezer did not accept this suggestion, noting that the Board of Trustees has a fiduciary responsibility to the university; if they don’t have a validated model, there is a problem. Professor Marotta-Walters noted that, with regard to this plan, the Board did the “what,” leaving the “how” to the administration. They did not get involved in implementation, which has been left to a combined faculty/administrative group. She noted that she would support Professor Gutman’s amendment as it keeps the Senate from looking ridiculous in the eyes of the administration.

Professor Wirtz noted the Senate members arguing the most vociferously against Professor Gutman’s amendment are those who have looked in the greatest detail at the way the finances are handled at GW. There are numerous sleights of hand that can occur in these models; for example, the President did not discuss the discount rate in his December presentation to the Senate until he was asked about it during the Q&A. Professor Wirtz noted that Professor Yezer’s wording frames RC8 in the wording of an expert—of someone who understands how the sleight of hand can occur—in such a way as to avoid those sleights. He understands Professor Gutman’s interest in simplifying this language and cutting to the chase, but he feels this point in the resolution doesn’t

warrant that simplification. Going with the experts in the room makes this an iron-clad resolution. Professor Marotta-Walters added that the actual numbers are being constructed by a committee led by the Provost that includes Professor Cordes and two other faculty members; it is a bad sign if the Senate cannot trust its own faculty to develop these models.

Professor Gutman pled guilty to his own ignorance and noted that his goal is not only simplification of the language but also to draft something that is both implementable as well as reasonable and rational. He noted that there is nothing inconsistent with his proposal with the sharing, validating, reviewing, etc. of the available data. To his mind, and he believes to most people's minds, that process is entirely consistent with principles of shared governance; this is what he supports.

Professor Wirtz disagreed, noting that it is fairly easy to manipulate one of the relevant variables to reach a desirable endpoint, but it is very difficult to manipulate them all. Professor's Yezer's proposed language addresses the specific indicators with which there is a potential problem. Professor Yezer noted that he has implemented business models for organizations much larger than GW; there is a way to do it and get the "right" answers. He stated that GW has experienced a major budget crunch due to poor business models. The current plan is a major initiative that could get the university into even more trouble.

No further debate occurred, and a vote on the motion to amend RC8 with Professor Gutman's language failed the simple majority requirement.

Debate continued on Professor Yezer's amendment. Professor Zara proposed adding "further" before "implementing" to clarify the Senate's understanding that the plan is underway. The amendment was seconded and passed by voice vote.

No further debate occurred, and a vote on the motion to amend RC8 with Professor Yezer's language passed the simple majority requirement. A vote on RC8 as amended passed the simple majority requirement.

Whereas Clause 1:

Professor Wagner asked whether Professor Marotta-Walters wanted to add the AAUP statement she read earlier. Professor Marotta-Walters responded that she would like that statement to be its own WC. No further debate occurred.

Whereas Clause 2 (New):

Professor Marotta-Walters proposed the following language for a second WC to be inserted after WC2: "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."

Professor Wirtz asked what the intent of the term "faculty" is, given that previous administrations have satisfied this requirement through the appointment of hand-picked faculty members. Professor Marotta-Walters understood the intent of this joint statement to refer to faculty writ large. In other words, "faculty" refers to one of the pillars of shared governance.

Professor Swaine asked that the Senate seriously consider treating the operative clauses as a done deal and find some way of committing the drafting of the WCs to some august body to be selected by the Senate. He noted that if the Senate reaches the end of this discussion without having adopted the resolution, its work will have been squandered anyway. He wanted to be realistic about the process, given the late hour, and delegate the remainder of the process with the goal of returning the final revised document to the Senate for approval at its next meeting. He understands and regrets the delay this causes, but he doesn't see the current task being completed tonight. Formally, Professor Swaine moved to commit the resolution to a drafting committee to complete the drafting of the WCs.

Professor Orti asked whether it would be possible to identify which WCs are problematic for the membership. Parliamentarian Charnovitz responded that proper order dictates a sequential review of the clauses. He noted that the choice now is to commit the resolution to a committee to address the WCs and return the resolution to the next Senate meeting.

Professor Swaine expressed his concern that trundling on at this pace will result in an unfinished process this evening. The items under consideration now are, relatively speaking, uncontroversial, as compared to the items already debated, which include an indictment of what's been done and a factual account of everything that has happened. He moved to commit the resolution to a drafting committee, composed of proponents of the resolution and other parties to be designated by the FSEC Chair, which will work to edit the Whereas clauses and the title of the resolution, the Resolving clauses having been debated and at least preliminarily approved by the Senate, in time to be considered at the next meeting of the Senate. The motion was seconded.

No further debate occurred, and the motion passed the simple majority requirement.

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)

Given the late hour, the FSEC Chair sought and received Senate approval to withdraw consideration of Resolution 20/10. She anticipated that it would be returned to the Senate at the February meeting.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

None.

GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Nominations for election of new members to Senate standing committees
 - None
- II. Reports of the Standing Committees
 - Professor Zara reported that the drafts of the four strategic planning committees are due on January 24, 2020. All four committees are far along in

their work and continue to meet with a variety of faculty and administrative groups.

- Professor Cordes noted that the Provost has created his own advisory committee to focus specifically on the strategic plan and the implications of it. The committee includes Professor Cordes, Professor Dylan Conger, Professor Marie Price, Dean Pam Jeffries, Interim Dean Paul Wahlbeck, and Dean Ruben Brigety. This committee will meet weekly, and the Provost is eager to put numbers behind the plan. Professor Cordes noted that the Provost is also interested in looking at STEM beyond discrete majors and into how it can be integrated into other majors and as minors.

III. Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Sylvia Marotta-Walters, Chair

- The President has been very good about engaging with Professor Marotta-Walters on timeline adjustments; thus far, everything is proceeding according to the approved timeline, which is designed to coordinate the release of reports from the strategic planning and relevant Senate committees (on January 24).
- The FSEC will meet on January 31 and will take up the revised Resolution 20/9 in advance of the February Senate meeting.
- There will be a joint meeting of the FSEC and the Strategic Planning Task Force on Tuesday, February 4; this will be the first time that every output from this process will be discussed by the two groups in concert.
- The special committee report is due February 3 to the FSEC.
- The Senate meets next on February 14, and the Board meets on February 6-7. Their actions will be based on the same materials the FSEC will have in hand on January 31.
- The Special Faculty Assembly date has been set for February 25 at 4pm in the Jack Morton Auditorium with a concurrent broadcast location at the Virginia Science and Technology Campus.
- There have been two major culture initiatives: the OurGW Day was an additional day off provided to faculty and staff on Monday, December 23, and the restoration of the tuition remission benefits to their previous levels. Recognition tools will soon be distributed to the university community that will allow for the recognition of employees behaving in ways that demonstrate the university's service framework is being implemented.
- At the University Leadership Council meeting this past Tuesday, it was clear that the Senate Research committee is actively involved in working with the High-Impact Research committee. They are building on work that the Senate Research committee did last year.

IV. Provost's Remarks

Vice Provost Bracey presented an update from Provost Blake on the enrollment task force. On December 18, the Provost charged a new faculty/student/administrative task force to analyze and prepare guidance and evaluate scenarios for achieving a 20% reduction of the undergraduate population on the Foggy Bottom campus and the increase of STEM majors to 30% of the overall undergraduate population.

Provost Blake is chairing this committee, which will work closely to deliver its outputs to the strategic planning committee on High-Quality Undergraduate Education. While the strategic planning committee is looking at strategy, this task force is looking at the tactical realities of achieving GW's strategic goal. The task force held an hour-long organizational meeting in December, during which the group discussed, among other things, key objectives and initial working milestones. The task force held its first working meeting of two hours on January 6. This initial discussion revolved around collective authoritative third-party information sources that might suggest the education needs of future students. Moving forward, as Professor Cordes mentioned, the group will be meeting on a weekly basis. The task force will have open discussions about what the George Washington University's academic portfolio should be in the next five to ten years, incorporating the vision of our 30/20 aspirations. The Provost's office will be providing information about available resources and realities of the present educational infrastructure as well. Professor Cordes mentioned many of the task force members; the full roster is Provost Brian Blake (chair), Dylan Conger (Trachtenberg School of Public Policy & Administration), Professor Joe Cordes (Columbian College of Arts & Sciences), Professor Marie Price (Columbian College of Arts & Sciences), Derek Lowe (undergraduate student/Columbian College of Arts & Sciences), ESIA Dean Ruben Brigety, CCAS Interim Dean Paul Wahlbeck, SON Dean Pamela Jeffries, and SEAS Dean John Lach, and Tyson Brown (staff/Enrollment & Student Success). The task force is also taking nominations for new members; these may be submitted to the Provost's assistant, Jen Mitchell. The Provost regrets missing today's robust discussion and looks forward to providing a more fulsome report at the next Senate meeting.

V. President's Remarks

Vice Provost Bracey delivered the President's remarks in his absence.

The strategic planning process is moving forward this semester in earnest, and work remains on track to seek Board approval in June. The next milestone is January 24, when interim reports from the strategic planning committees will be sent to the Strategic Planning Task Force, Faculty Senate, and Board of Trustees as well as posted on the strategic planning website for community feedback. Feedback can also be shared at strategicplan.gwu.edu.

The Strategic Campus and Facilities Master Plan is unfolding alongside the strategic plan. This master plan will provide vision and principles for GW's campus identity and aids GW's shared aspirations. Faculty will hear more this semester about opportunities to participate in that process; the President thanks Drs. Sidawy and Costello for their leadership in this process.

The university is making progress toward improving safety and security across campus and has installed a total of 1487 tap-access locks across fifteen residence halls, completing GW's residence hall update. Tap access decreases theft and also vulnerabilities associated with lost keys. The classroom access control pilot project at the Law School is nearing successful completion. Preliminary work has commenced to address access control to the exterior of high-traffic buildings and the interior

classrooms and auditoriums at all university campuses. Approximately 19,049 cell phones were added to GWAlert; 85% of these individuals now have at least one cell phone in GWAlert, which was a 35% increase. This allows the university to reach more people during emergencies. GW continues to improve threat assessment operations and response plans. GW announced this week that James Tate is the new GW Chief of Police. Chief Tate has more than three decades of experience in law enforcement. He comes to GW from Rice University in Houston, where he also served as Chief of Police. Chief Tate is starting on January 21.

Barbara Bass officially joins GW on January 15 as Vice President for Health Affairs, Dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, and CEO of the Medical Faculty Associates. The President thanks Dr. Akman for his many years of service at GW. For more than 40 years, Jeff has distinguished himself as a leader, role model, and a tireless advocate for his students, faculty, staff, and alumni. We are grateful for his service and leadership and thank him for his contribution to the university and, of course, the contributions he will continue to make.

The President, Provost, and others are meeting with the final candidates for the deanship of the Law School this week. The Provost looks forward to making a decision early in the spring semester regarding that appointment.

The President continues to engage with faculty in a variety of ways as well as holding student office hours, roundtables, and dinners. This semester, he will travel to cities across the country to meet with alumni, families, students, and friends for what has been billed as GW and You Community Receptions. Next week, on January 14, the series will kick off in Philadelphia to be followed over the course of the spring by visits to Los Angeles, San Francisco, Miami, Tampa, northern Virginia, Richmond, New York, and Boston.

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Professor Orti requested a clarification as to who will serve on the Whereas clause drafting committee and how it will proceed. Professor Marotta-Walters responded that the only thing the Senate voted on was that the committee would be constituted and would be comprised from the Senate and the original drafters. Other than this, specific membership was not established. The work will need to be completed by January 31 in order to be on the FSEC's January agenda. Professor Marotta-Walters asked for volunteers to serve on the committee. Professor Orti, Professor Marotta-Walters, Professor Cordes, Professor Swaine, and Professor Yezer agreed to serve.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:18pm.



A RESOLUTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE (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.”

“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;”¹

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”;

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

WHEREAS, the first of the 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 item: *“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?”* The Senate and each of the four committees mentioned above (a) Educational Policy & Technology, b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting and 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

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

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”;

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc announced on July 9, 2019, a plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the composition of the student majors and therefore to alter the curricular program of the university;²

WHEREAS, the Senate, and in particular its Educational Policy Committee, have in the past consistently been informed and consulted about intended changes in policy, prior to action;

WHEREAS, the university administration and Faculty Senate have in the past consistently taken deliberate, considered, and collaborative action to select the level of undergrad undergraduate enrollment of 2018-19 and previous years as the proper and right size;

WHEREAS, such information and consultation did not precede President LeBlanc's announcement of the plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the composition of the student majors;

WHEREAS, these plans were initiated immediately, affecting enrollments for 2019-20 and admissions for the subsequent year;³

WHEREAS, hereas, neither the Faculty Assembly nor the Faculty Senate as a whole nor Faculty Senate committees were consulted for information, approval, or oversight prior to formulating or implementing the reduction and recomposition of the student body;

WHEREAS, the strategic planning committees of faculty, staff, and students were formed only after formulation of strategic plans of reducing the student body and increasing STEM majors;⁴

WHEREAS, the strategic planning committee on High Quality Undergraduate Education has a charge so narrow it must assume as a given the reduction in the size of the student body and increase in STEM majors;⁵

WHEREAS, the narrowness of this charge prevents the strategic planning committee from providing input, information, or oversight on the reduction in the size of the student body and increase in STEM majors;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan, Article III, Section 1 (4) states that the Senate itself shall “be the Faculty agency to which the President initially presents information and

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

³ “Ed Gillis, who was [tapped](#) in August as the interim vice provost for enrollment management, said the drop in undergraduate enrollment is the result of the intentional [effort](#) to reduce the size of the student body in accordance with LeBlanc’s plan.”

<https://www.gwhatchet.com/2019/11/07/enrollment-falls-for-first-time-in-six-years-in-first-step-of-planned-20-percent-cut/>

⁴ <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/strategic-plan-committee-members-announced>

⁵ See appendix A.

which he consults concerning proposed changes in existing policies or promulgation of new policies”;

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc, in the September 13, October 11, and November 8, 2019 Senate meetings stated he “reserved the right to be rational” about reduction in the size of the student body and increase in STEM majors;

WHEREAS, acting rationally requires changing or not initiating plans if data indicates the plan to be harmful;

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc promised that changes to the undergraduate student body will not cause diversity to go down “one iota;”⁶

WHEREAS, despite such promises no existing data and no model and no budget available to the Faculty Senate or its committees indicates that GWU can, over a four year horizon, simultaneously reduce the size of its student body, increase STEM majors, maintain its commitment to academic excellence, and maintain its commitment to student diversity in terms of ethnicity, race, sex, gender, cultural background, national background, and socioeconomic status without severely undermining the budget of the university;⁷

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc was asked as recently as the November 8, 2019 Senate meeting to pause the plans to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and change the composition of the student majors; and

WHEREAS, on November 8, 2019, President LeBlanc, reiterated a commitment to neither delay nor alter his plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the composition of the student majors and therefore to alter the curricular program of the university; **NOW, THEREFORE**,

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

- 1) That the adoption and implementation of plans to reduce the size of the student body and to increase the ratio of STEM majors violates established principles of shared governance.
- 2) That merely informing the faculty of plans does not constitute shared governance.
- 3) That including the Chair of Senate Executive Committee in strategic planning discussions shall not be understood as sufficient, on its own, to constitute shared governance.
- 4) That shared governance requires meaningful input and oversight by the Senate as a whole, by Senate Committees other than the Executive Committee, by faculty other than the Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, and in cases of strategic planning, by the Faculty Assembly itself prior to implementation or announcement of major initiatives.

⁶ <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/faculty-president-leblanc-discuss-strategic-plan-objectives-process>

⁷ See Appendix B

- 5) That information concerning potential enrollment and/or budgetary changes associated with the strategic plan that are provided to the strategic planning committees for World Class Faculty, High Quality Undergraduate Education, Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education, High Impact Research and to the Strategic Planning Taskforce be simultaneously made available to each of the following Faculty Senate committees: (a) Educational Policy & Technology, (b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, (c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, (d) Research and (e) Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policy Committee (ASPP).
- 6) That President LeBlanc's commitment to diversity is to be applauded.
- 7) That the Faculty Senate calls on the university to expand academic excellence, and to increase diversity on each measure of student diversity in terms of ethnicity, race, sex, gender, cultural background, national background, and socioeconomic status.
- 8) That the administration should take the rational course of action and accordingly immediately put on hold all plans to reduce enrollment and increase STEM until such time as a valid model that demonstrates its plans are budget neutral or better, and under which each diversity indicator does not go down "one iota" is both available and accepted through recognized processes of shared governance.

Guillermo Orti
Daniel Schwartz
Ioannis Eleftherianos

19 November 2019

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.

1. **Principles**

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

2. **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?

3. **Metrics**

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

4. **Resources**

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

CONCLUSION

- ▶ With a target enrollment of 2,100 first-years, we can enhance academic quality.
- ▶ Strategies that minimize weakest STEM students (ACRK=7) will enhance quality, but further distorts university's gender balance and preclude SEAS from growing if the applicant pool remains the same.
- ▶ The 2019 data suggests that reducing enrollment by 450 additional students and maintaining our academic profile will result in a loss of tuition revenue of approximately \$16M. Housing revenue is supplemental loss.
- ▶ There is no model that meets all enrollment objectives.
 - ▶ Need to decide what is the right compromise to make between enhancing academic profile, net tuition goals, diversity goals (including Pell and gender), and school balance.
- ▶ Four critical points about the 2020 and beyond cycles:
 - ▶ The 2019 enrollment patterns reflect who applied, an enrollment strategy designed to balance various objectives, econometric models based upon prior year patterns, the market, the economy and luck.
 - ▶ The 2020 pool will be different than the 2019 applicant pool.
 - ▶ If the economy becomes weaker (recession), all bets are off!
 - ▶ Changes being made (including investing in building applicant pool with additional name buys) will increase uncertainty in 2020.



A RESOLUTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE (20/9 with friendly amendments)

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.”

“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”¹

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”;

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

WHEREAS, the first of the 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 item: *“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?”* The Senate and each of the four committees mentioned

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

above (a) Educational Policy & Technology, b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting and 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”;

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 university;²

WHEREAS, the Senate, and in particular its Educational Policy Committee, have in the past consistently been informed and consulted about intended changes in policy, prior to action;

WHEREAS, the university administration and Faculty Senate have in the past consistently taken deliberate, considered, and collaborative action to select the level of undergraduate enrollment of 2018-19 and previous years as the proper and right size;

WHEREAS, such information and consultation did not precede President LeBlanc's announcement of the plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the composition of the student majors;

WHEREAS, these plans were initiated immediately, affecting enrollments for 2019-20 and admissions for the subsequent year;³

WHEREAS, neither the Faculty Assembly nor the Faculty Senate as a whole nor Faculty Senate committees were consulted for information, approval, or oversight prior to formulating or implementing the reduction and **alteration of the subject balance** of the student body;

WHEREAS, the strategic planning committees of faculty, staff, and students were formed only after formulation of strategic plans of reducing the student body and increasing STEM majors;⁴

WHEREAS, the **charge of the** strategic planning committee on High Quality Undergraduate Education assumes as a given the reduction in the size of the student body and increase in STEM majors;⁵

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

³ “Officials said the decrease in enrollment is the first phase of a planned **reduction** in enrollment of nearly 20 percent over the next five years.”... “Ed Gillis, who was **tapped** in August as the interim vice provost for enrollment management, said the drop in undergraduate enrollment is the result of the intentional **effort** to reduce the size of the student body in accordance with LeBlanc’s plan.” <https://www.gwhatchet.com/2019/11/07/enrollment-falls-for-first-time-in-six-years-in-first-step-of-planned-20-percent-cut/>

⁴ <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/strategic-plan-committee-members-announced>

⁵ See appendix A.

WHEREAS, this charge does not offer the strategic planning committee the opportunity to provide input, information, or oversight on the reduction in the size of the student body and increase in STEM majors;

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”;

Two whereas clauses deleted

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc stated repeatedly that changes to the undergraduate student body will not cause diversity to go down “one iota;”⁶

WHEREAS, no data, model, or budget available to the Faculty Senate or its committees indicates that GWU can, over a four-year horizon, simultaneously reduce the size of its student body, increase STEM majors, maintain its commitment to academic excellence, and maintain its commitment to student diversity in terms of ethnicity, race, sex, gender, cultural background, national background, and socioeconomic status without severely affecting the budget of the university;⁷

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc was asked as recently as the November 8, 2019 Senate meeting to pause the plans to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and change the composition of the student majors;

WHEREAS, on November 8, 2019, President LeBlanc reiterated a commitment to neither delay nor alter his plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the balance of the student majors and therefore to alter the curricular program of the university; **NOW, THEREFORE**,

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

- 1) That adoption and implementation of plans to reduce the size of the student body and to increase the ratio of STEM majors violates established principles of shared governance.
- 2) That merely informing the faculty of plans does not constitute shared governance.
- 3) That individual members of the Senate Executive Committee, and even the committee as a whole, cannot be a conduit of meaningful consultation about changes which affect the well-being of the university unless given the opportunity to deliberate with the Senate and its Committees, and to formulate considered opinions, as enshrined in shared governance.

⁶ <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/faculty-president-leblanc-discuss-strategic-plan-objectives-process>

⁷ See Appendix B

- 4) That shared governance requires meaningful input and oversight by the Senate as a whole, by Senate Committees other than the Executive Committee, by faculty other than the Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, and in cases of strategic planning, by the Faculty Assembly itself prior to implementation or announcement of major initiatives.
- 5) That information concerning potential enrollment and/or budgetary changes associated with the strategic plan that are provided to the strategic planning committees for World Class Faculty, High Quality Undergraduate Education, Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education, High Impact Research and to the Strategic Planning Taskforce **be made available simultaneously** to each of the following Faculty Senate committees: (a) Educational Policy & Technology, (b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, (c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, (d) Research and (e) Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policy Committee (ASPP).
- 6) That President LeBlanc's commitment to diversity is to be applauded.
- 7) That the Faculty Senate calls on the university to expand academic excellence, and to **maintain or increase diversity with respect to variables such** as ethnicity, race, sex, gender, cultural background, national background, and socioeconomic status.
- 8) **That the Senate asks the administration to not institute plans to reduce enrollment and increase STEM until after a) the financial implications of these plans are clearly outlined, b) it submits a valid model under which diversity indicators are not diminished, and c) its plans are considered, debated, and accepted through recognized (see above) processes of shared governance.**

Submitted with friendly amendments by

Guillermo Orti
Daniel Schwartz
Ioannis Eleftherianos

28 December 2019

<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.

1. **Principles**

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

2. **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?

3. **Metrics**

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

4. **Resources**

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

APPENDIX B:

FALL 2019 AND SIMULATING FUTURE ENROLLMENT, Presented by the Provost, October 24, 2019

ACHIEVING 2100 STUDENTS

MAXIMIZING STEM; TRADE-OFF BETWEEN QUALITY AND \$\$



	BASELINE/GOAL*	(1A) 2100: MAX STEM then PROFILE	(1B) 2100: MAX STEM then NTR	(1C) 2100: STEM if ACRK>7 then NTR
ENROLLMENT FACTS				
	#####	#####	Delta	#####
Admit	10746	10607	(139)	9227
Matric	2550	2100	(450)	2100
Yield	23.7%	19.8%	-3.9%	22.8%
				Delta
				#####
Admit				11470
Matric				(1519)
Yield				-1.0%
				18.3%
				Delta
				#####
Admit				724
Matric				(450)
Yield				-5.4%
STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS				
ACRK (Academic Quality)	4.46	3.6	(0.8)	5.2
NDRK (Financial Need)	2.69	3.4	0.7	2.4
STEM_Major	24%	45%	22.0%	45%
SOC_NoAsian	23%	20%	-2.5%	19.9%
male	37%	31%	-6.0%	39.7%
International	15%	6%	-8.6%	17.8%
Pell_Eligible**	15%	22%	6.6%	14.4%
SCHOOL BASED ENROLLMENTS				
CCAS	49%	53.6%	4.2%	54.2%
ESIA	20%	16.3%	-3.9%	12.3%
GWSB	14%	8.5%	-6.0%	12.1%
SEAS	10%	15.0%	5.4%	15.0%
GWSPH	6%	2.0%	-4.2%	6.4%
SELECTED FINANCIAL METRICS				
Tuition Discount	42.3%	57.6%	-15.4%	33.7%
Average Net Tuition	\$34,841	\$26,341	-\$8,499	\$39,765
Aggregate Net Tuition	\$88,843,629	\$55,312,234	-\$33,531,395	\$83,503,360
Aggregate Inst Grant	\$57,233,121	\$64,975,575	\$7,742,454	\$36,790,915
				Delta
				#####
Tuition Discount				8.6%
Average Net Tuition				-\$4,924
Aggregate Net Tuition				-\$5,340,269
Aggregate Inst Grant				\$44,397,956
				Delta
				#####
Tuition Discount				39.2%
Average Net Tuition				\$36,147
Aggregate Net Tuition				-\$12,918,560
Aggregate Inst Grant				-\$12,835,165
Good News (Summary)		STEM # (not quality); Pell Up; Academic Profile+	STEM # (not quality); Males +; \$\$ loss minimized	Academic Profile+; STEM # and quality
BAD News (Summary)		\$\$ Very Hard; Males-	Academic Profile Falls Significantly	Males; \$\$ mid loss; Diversity-

*Data is based upon week of 9/10. **Pell eligible is based upon earned income.

CONCLUSION

- ▶ With a target enrollment of 2,100 first-years, we can enhance academic quality.
- ▶ Strategies that minimize weakest STEM students (ACRK=7) will enhance quality, but further distorts university's gender balance and preclude SEAS from growing if the applicant pool remains the same.
- ▶ The 2019 data suggests that reducing enrollment by 450 additional students and maintaining our academic profile will result in a loss of tuition revenue of approximately \$16M. Housing revenue is supplemental loss.
- ▶ There is no model that meets all enrollment objectives.
 - ▶ Need to decide what is the right compromise to make between enhancing academic profile, net tuition goals, diversity goals (including Pell and gender), and school balance.
- ▶ Four critical points about the 2020 and beyond cycles:
 - ▶ The 2019 enrollment patterns reflect who applied, an enrollment strategy designed to balance various objectives, econometric models based upon prior year patterns, the market, the economy and luck.
 - ▶ The 2020 pool will be different than the 2019 applicant pool.
 - ▶ If the economy becomes weaker (recession), all bets are off!
 - ▶ Changes being made (including investing in building applicant pool with additional name buys) will increase uncertainty in 2020.

Marked Version Reflecting Edits Made in Meeting



A Resolution on Shared Governance (20/9 with friendly amendments)

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.”

“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”¹

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

“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.”

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”;

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

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

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.94", Right: 0"

Deleted: ->

WHEREAS, the first of the 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 item: *“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?”* The Senate and each of the four committees mentioned above (a) Educational Policy & Technology, b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting and 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”;

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 university;²

WHEREAS, the Senate, and in particular its Educational Policy Committee, have in the past consistently been informed and consulted about intended changes in policy, prior to action;

WHEREAS, the university administration and Faculty Senate have in the past consistently taken deliberate, considered, and collaborative action to select the level of undergraduate enrollment of 2018-19 and previous years as the proper and right size;

WHEREAS, such information and consultation did not precede President LeBlanc's announcement of the plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the composition of the student majors;

WHEREAS, these plans were initiated immediately, affecting enrollments for 2019-20 and admissions for the subsequent year;³

WHEREAS, neither the Faculty Assembly nor the Faculty Senate as a whole nor Faculty Senate committees were consulted for information, approval, or oversight prior to formulating or implementing the reduction and **alteration of the subject balance** of the student body;

WHEREAS, the strategic planning committees of faculty, staff, and students were formed only after formulation of strategic plans of reducing the student body and increasing STEM majors;⁴

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

³ “Officials said the decrease in enrollment is the first phase of a planned **reduction in enrollment of nearly 20 percent over the next five years.**” ... “Ed Gillis, who was **tapped** in August as the interim vice provost for enrollment management, said the drop in undergraduate enrollment is the result of the intentional **effort** to reduce the size of the student body in accordance with LeBlanc's plan.” <https://www.gwhatchet.com/2019/11/07/enrollment-falls-for-first-time-in-six-years-in-first-step-of-planned-20-percent-cut/>

⁴ <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/strategic-plan-committee-members-announced>

WHEREAS, the charge of the strategic planning committee on High Quality Undergraduate Education assumes as a given the reduction in the size of the student body and increase in STEM majors;⁵

WHEREAS, this charge does not offer the strategic planning committee the opportunity to provide input, information, or oversight on the reduction in the size of the student body and increase in STEM majors;

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”;

Two whereas clauses deleted

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc stated repeatedly that changes to the undergraduate student body will not cause diversity to go down “one iota,”⁶

WHEREAS, no data, model, or budget available to the Faculty Senate or its committees indicates that GWU can, over a four-year horizon, simultaneously reduce the size of its student body, increase STEM majors, maintain its commitment to academic excellence, and maintain its commitment to student diversity in terms of ethnicity, race, sex, gender, cultural background, national background, and socioeconomic status without severely affecting the budget of the university;⁷

WHEREAS, President LeBlanc was asked as recently as the November 8, 2019 Senate meeting to pause the plans to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and change the composition of the student majors;

WHEREAS, on November 8, 2019, President LeBlanc reiterated a commitment to neither delay nor alter his plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the balance of the student majors and therefore to alter the curricular program of the university; **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

1) That the process of adoption and implementation 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.

Deleted: ere

Deleted: violates established

Deleted: 2) That merely informing the faculty of plans does not constitute shared governance.⁴

⁵ See appendix A.

⁶ <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/faculty-president-leblanc-discuss-strategic-plan-objectives-process>

⁷ See Appendix B

3.

4) 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.

5.

6) That the administration's and Board of Trustees' commitment to diversity is to be applauded.

7) That the Faculty Senate calls on the university to develop plans that raise academic excellence, that maintain or increase diversity, and that expand inclusion.

8) 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, 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.

Submitted with friendly amendments by

Guillermo Orti
Daniel Schwartz
Ioannis Eleftherianos

28 December 2019

Deleted:) That individual members of the Senate Executive Committee, and even the committee as a whole, cannot be a conduit of meaningful consultation about changes which affect the well-being of the university unless given the opportunity to deliberate with the Senate and its Committees, and to formulate considered opinions, as enshrined in shared governance.

Deleted: Senate Committees other than the Executive Committee, by faculty other than the Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, and in cases of strategic planning, by the Faculty Assembly itself prior

Deleted: That information concerning potential enrollment and/or budgetary changes associated with the strategic plan that are provided to the strategic planning committees for World Class Faculty, High Quality Undergraduate Education, Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education, High Impact Research and to the Strategic Planning Taskforce be made available *simultaneously* to each of the following Faculty Senate committees: (a) Educational Policy & Technology, (b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, (c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, (d) Research and (e) Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policy Committee (ASPP).⁴

Deleted: President LeBlanc's

Deleted: expand academic excellence, and to maintain or increase diversity with respect to variables such as ethnicity, race, sex, gender, cultural background, national background, and socioeconomic status.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"

Deleted: pause

Deleted:

Deleted: a) its plans are considered, debated, and accepted through recognized (see above) processes of shared governance and

Deleted: each

Deleted: indicator does not go down "one iota," and that at the same time demonstrates its plans are projected to be at least budget neutral

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.

1. **Principles**

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

2. **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?

3. **Metrics**

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

4. **Resources**

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

APPENDIX B:

FALL 2019 AND SIMULATING FUTURE ENROLLMENT, Presented by the Provost,
October 24, 2019

ACHIEVING 2100 STUDENTS

MAXIMIZING STEM; TRADE-OFF BETWEEN QUALITY AND \$\$

THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, DC

	BASELINE/GOAL*	(1A) 2100: MAX STEM then PROFILE	(1B) 2100: MAX STEM then NTR	(1C) 2100: STEM if ACRK>7 then NTR
ENROLLMENT FACTS				
	####	####	####	####
		Delta	Delta	Delta
Admit	10746	10607 (139)	9227 (1519)	11470 (724)
Matric	2550	2100 (450)	2100 (450)	2100 (450)
Yield	23.7%	19.8% (-3.9%)	22.8% (-1.0%)	18.3% (-5.4%)
STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS				
ACRK (Academic Quality)	4.46	3.6 (0.8)	5.2 (0.8)	4.0 (0.5)
NDRK (Financial Need)	2.69	3.4 (0.7)	2.4 (0.3)	2.5 (0.2)
STEM_Major	24%	45% (22.0%)	45% (22%)	35% (11%)
SOC_NoAsian	23%	20% (-2.5%)	19.9% (-3.0%)	15.3% (-7.5%)
male	37%	31% (-6.0%)	39.7% (2.7%)	32.7% (-4.3%)
International	15%	6% (-8.6%)	17.8% (3.3%)	10.4% (-4.2%)
Pell_Eligible**	15%	22% (6.6%)	14.4% (-1.1%)	10.4% (-5.1%)
SCHOOL BASED ENROLLMENTS				
CCAS	49%	53.6% (4.2%)	54.2% (5.2%)	54.0% (5.0%)
ESIA	20%	16.3% (-3.9%)	12.3% (-8.0%)	17.4% (-2.9%)
GWSB	14%	8.5% (-6.0%)	12.1% (-2.4%)	11.4% (-3.1%)
SEAS	10%	15.0% (5.4%)	15.0% (5.4%)	11.3% (1.8%)
GWSPH	6%	2.0% (-4.2%)	6.4% (0.4%)	5.9% (-0.1%)
SELECTED FINANCIAL METRICS				
Tuition Discount	42.3%	57.6% (15.4%)	33.7% (8.6%)	39.2% (3.1%)
Average Net Tuition	\$34,841	\$26,341 (\$8,499)	\$39,765 (\$4,924)	\$36,147 (\$1,307)
Aggregate Net Tuition	\$88,843,629	\$55,312,234 (\$33,531,395)	\$83,503,360 (\$5,340,269)	\$75,925,069 (\$12,918,560)
Aggregate Inst Grant	\$57,233,121	\$64,975,575 (\$7,742,454)	\$36,790,915 (\$20,442,206)	\$44,397,956 (\$12,835,165)
Good News (Summary)		STEM # (not quality); Pell Up; Academic Profile+	STEM # (not quality); Males + \$\$ loss minimized	Academic Profile+; STEM # (and quality)
BAD News (Summary)		\$\$ Very Hard; Males-	Academic Profile Falls Significantly	Males; \$\$ mid loss; Diversity-

*Data is based upon week of 9/10. **Pell eligible is based upon earned income.

CONCLUSION

- ▶ With a target enrollment of 2,100 first-years, we can enhance academic quality.
- ▶ Strategies that minimize weakest STEM students (ACRK=7) will enhance quality, but further distorts university's gender balance and preclude SEAS from growing if the applicant pool remains the same.
- ▶ The 2019 data suggests that reducing enrollment by 450 additional students and maintaining our academic profile will result in a loss of tuition revenue of approximately \$16M. Housing revenue is supplemental loss.
- ▶ There is no model that meets all enrollment objectives.
 - ▶ Need to decide what is the right compromise to make between enhancing academic profile, net tuition goals, diversity goals (including Pell and gender), and school balance.
- ▶ Four critical points about the 2020 and beyond cycles:
 - ▶ The 2019 enrollment patterns reflect who applied, an enrollment strategy designed to balance various objectives, econometric models based upon prior year patterns, the market, the economy and luck.
 - ▶ The 2020 pool will be different than the 2019 applicant pool.
 - ▶ If the economy becomes weaker (recession), all bets are off!
 - ▶ Changes being made (including investing in building applicant pool with additional name buys) will increase uncertainty in 2020.



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

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

Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)

January 10, 2020

Sylvia A. Marotta-Walters, Chair

Shared Governance

Shared governance was the major topic at the December 13, 2019, Senate meeting and is also the main topic at today's meeting. The Senate in December voted to update its committee names, to align with the mission of each committee and to delete from the Faculty Organization Plan those committees which had not been active over the last few years.

In response to the Assembly's October petition, the Senate requested that the Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) call a Special Assembly to discuss the issues raised by the Assembly petition. The date for the Special Assembly was set by the Senate for a two week period in February. The FSEC subsequently met on December 20, and decided that the Special Assembly will be held on February 25, 2020, at 4:00 pm. Further details will be posted on the Senate website as they are finalized.

The Senate established a Special Committee to draft a response to the October petition. That special committee comprises six members, elected by the Senate, and their report will be sent to the Senate by February 3, 2020; the report will become the Assembly agenda. The six members of the Special Committee are Professors Sarah Wagner (Chair); Joe Cordes; Guillermo Orti; Kausik Sarkar; Dan Schwartz, and Jason Zara.

Actions of the Executive Committee

The FSEC Chair provided Provost Brian Blake with names of faculty who could serve on a committee to define the mechanisms by which the reduction in the undergraduate population over the next five years will be implemented. The committee has been formed and includes at least three members who are senators or former senators. This committee will define the models by which the 20% reduction might be feasible, along with their financial implications.

Faculty Role in Strategic Planning

The FSEC is committed to providing a strong faculty voice in the current strategic planning process, as well as discussing ways to ensure that substantive issues are brought to the Faculty with sufficient time to allow for careful and full consideration before they're adopted as a future direction for the university. The size and composition of the undergraduate population is clearly one of those issues that while it ultimately is the legal responsibility of the Trustees, is also an essential aspect of faculty responsibility. The issue is provided in best practices documents such as 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," which states:

"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."

The administration has stated that in hindsight the decisions to reduce the undergraduate population and increase the STEM majors at the university could have involved the faculty earlier and with more clarity. The Senate also acknowledges that since the work of the Senate is done through its committee structure, the committees need to ensure continuity of mission and purpose as leadership and membership changes with changes in volunteers. One change in Senate practice that will result from the initiation of this strategic planning process is that committees have to review their purpose and make clear what matters should trigger a consultation with the faculty and what process should be used for early and thorough consultation.

The FSEC encourages all Senators to review the Senate Webpage on a regular basis, and encourage faculty in their schools to do the same. The timeline jointly defined by the Senate and the Administration is on schedule, and there are a number of important dates scheduled for the next couple of weeks.

Faculty Role on Strategic Initiative on Culture

The Culture Leadership Team (CLT), which includes faculty representation, reported two high profile outcomes of the culture initiative. The first was the addition of an “Our GW Day” to the university’s Winter Break Schedule to give staff and faculty additional time to spend with family, given the way the major holidays occurred in the middle of the week this year. The second was the restoration of full tuition remission for qualifying employees. Both initiatives have been well-received. Soon there will be recognition tools distributed to acknowledge those who are successfully implementing GW’s Service Framework.

Faculty Role on Strategic Initiative on Research

The Senate Research Committee continues to work collaboratively with the Strategic Planning Committee on High Impact Research. Research Committee members are reviewing preliminary materials on the research pillar, in preparation for the release of all committees’ reports from their respective strategic planning committees.

The second phase of the Research Ecosystem Assessment will continue with a report expected in early spring.

Faculty Personnel Matters

Grievances: There is one grievance in the School of Business, and one in the Columbian College.

Calendar

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be on January 31, 2020. As is our custom, all agenda items for the FSEC should be submitted one week prior to the scheduled meeting.