

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. THE SENATE COMMITTEES' RESPONSES:

Appointments, Salaries and Promotion Policies Committee

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

Research Committee

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

Education Policy and Technology Committee

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

Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

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

Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee

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

II. SHARED GOVERNANCE

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

III. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SOUGHT FROM PRESIDENT LEBLANC

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

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

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

IV. CONCLUSION

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

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

APPENDIX: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ASPP Committee Response: We have no knowledge.

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

ASPP Committee Responses:

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

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

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

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

Respectfully Submitted

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

Enrollments and Faculty Size (2012-2019)

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

¹ AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities

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

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

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

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

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

Research Committee
of the Faculty Senate
November 22, 2019



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Amendments to the Resolving Clauses Adopted by the Faculty Senate

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

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

⁴ Faculty Senate Minutes for October 11, 2019 Regular meeting

January 10, 2020

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

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

January 17, 2020

Dear President LeBlanc,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your time and attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

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

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

January 27, 2020

Dear President LeBlanc,

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your time and attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wagner
Daniel Schwartz
Joseph Cordes

Guillermo Orti
Jason Zara
Kausik Sarkar

February 5, 2020

Special Committee of the Faculty Senate:

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

Dear Colleagues:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

Thomas J. LeBlanc

January 31, 2020

Special Committee of the Faculty Senate:

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

Dear Colleagues:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

Thomas J. LeBlanc