



# Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, March 13, 2020, from 2:10-4:00pm  
in the State Room (1957 E Street NW).

## AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on February 14, 2020
3. President's Update on Strategic Initiatives and Senate Discussion (see attached letter from Chair Speights and President LeBlanc)
4. REPORTS: Updates from Senate Standing Committees on the Strategic Planning (as available) Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies (Murli Gupta, Chair); Educational Policy & Technology (Jason Zara, Chair); Fiscal Planning & Budgeting (Joe Cordes, Chair); Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (Ed Swaine, Chair); Research (Kausik Sarkar, Chair); University & Urban Affairs (Shaista Khilji, Chair)
5. REPORT: Core Indicators of Academic Excellence (Brian Blake, Provost)
6. RESOLUTION 20/11: To Amend the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate (Sylvia Marotta-Walters, Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee)
7. Introduction of Resolutions
8. GENERAL BUSINESS
  - a) Nominations for election of new members to Senate standing committees
  - b) Election of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Nominating Committee
    - Ernie Englander (GWSB)
  - c) Reports of Standing Committees
  - d) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Sylvia Marotta-Walters, Chair
  - e) Provost's Remarks
  - f) Chair's Remarks
9. Brief Statements and Questions
10. Adjournment

**Elizabeth A. Amundson**  
Secretary

## Joint Letter to GW Faculty from Chair Speights and President LeBlanc

March 4, 2020

Dear Members of the GW Faculty:

Following months of planning and debate, we thought it important to share some reflections on the strategic planning process and our renewed commitments to you and the George Washington University community. We have listened and heard your concerns, and together, we commit to meaningful communication and consultation with the faculty before making important academic decisions of shared governance.

We are grateful to the more than sixty faculty members who have served on strategic planning committees and the Strategic Planning Task Force and to those who have attended town hall, Faculty Assembly, and Faculty Senate meetings throughout the year. In these forums, in many other conversations, as well as through written feedback, the faculty has demonstrated its commitment to excellence and dedication to GW and its future.

Working with the Faculty Senate, we previously revised the timeline for the strategic planning process in response to concerns that the pace of planning was too rapid. We also heard concerns about the sufficiency of the information and data shared by the administration.

Specifically, we recognize that there are concerns about how the aspirational 20/30 enrollment targets were determined. The reduction in the size of the incoming classes on the Foggy Bottom campus is intended to strengthen the quality of the undergraduate educational experience, improve student life, and respond proactively to forecasted declines in the traditional college-age population. At a time when national enrollments are declining and GW enrollment is legally capped at the Foggy Bottom campus, this reduction will provide flexibility and sustainability for the operating model. The increased focus on STEM is intended to complement our historic strengths, increase intellectual diversity in accordance with our aspirational statement, and prepare students for increasingly technological working environments.

To help address these concerns going forward, Provost Blake has convened a Future Enrollment Task Force, which includes representatives from the Faculty Senate, academic leadership, and students, to explore options for implementation of the 20/30 targets in more detail. This group will share data and recommendations regularly through the Provost's report to the Faculty Senate beginning March 13. Once implementation plans are finalized in consultation with the faculty, we commit to evaluating progress on these goals with the Faculty Senate annually to determine whether we are meeting the expectations of the 20/30 targets.

As the university works toward its aspirational goals, we commit to providing more data associated with key metrics (such as diversity, meeting financial needs of students, and maintaining high quality enrollment standards), as well as associated financial implications. The Board supports the administration's commitment to annually report and review those metrics and data with the primary constituent groups of the university community, including the Faculty Senate and its committees. If the circumstances do not support the current strategy, the administration and the Board of Trustees will adapt the plan and targets as appropriate.

To reiterate, we heard you and we commit to:

1. improving communication and meaningful consultation with the faculty when making academic decisions of shared governance;
2. sharing relevant data and analytics with the Faculty Senate before critical academic decisions are finalized;
3. evaluating annually progress on enrollment goals with the Faculty Senate;
4. providing relevant data on key metrics including diversity, financial aid, and resource allotment.

These commitments reflect our belief that our faculty is indispensable -- integral not only to our mission of teaching and research but also to the vigorous discussions that will guide our future. We hope that these renewed commitments, the continued work to finalize a strategic plan and the associated implementation plans that will follow, will allow the Board, the administration, the faculty, staff, students, and the entire GW community to work together toward a shared vision of preeminence.

Sincerely,

Grace Speights  
Chair, Board of Trustees

Thomas LeBlanc  
President

# ASPP Committee response to High-Impact Research



## Areas of agreement:

1. Well-thought out
2. Comprehensive
3. Applaud objectives and goals
4. Important recommendations related to developing an appropriate infrastructure for high impact research

# ASPP Committee response to High-Impact Research



## Areas of concern:

1. Recommendation for **inclusive processes and language** missing:
  - In addition to junior faculty members, focus on senior faculty members
  - Encourage and support senior faculty to engage in HIR
2. Need **clear definition** of HIR
3. Need **metrics to measure** HIR
  - Ensure recognition of **wide range** of research
  - Include the **scholarship of teaching and learning**.
4. Investment in research infrastructure needs to be **balanced**
  - Needs of hard sciences *and* social sciences/humanities.
5. No mention of **GW libraries**
  - Libraries a cornerstone for high impact research

# ASPP Committee response to World Class Faculty



## Areas of Agreement:

1. Goal 1 (Faculty Excellence and Diversity) important
  - Existing breadth of diversity: e.g. demographic to perspectives to disciplines
  - Must clearly outline the types of diversity it would seek and retain
2. Under **B. Develop a University-wide High-Impact Hiring Plan focused on diversity:**
  - We agree with the need to *“Provide a framework for building out our aims as part of focused recruitment efforts, in order to ensure that **all recruitments** include an approved diversity plan, contain clearly established evaluation criteria...”*

# ASPP Committee response to World Class Faculty



## Areas of concern:

1. Report focuses on tenure track and junior faculty members
  - Should have equal efforts to engage with **all faculty** whose appointments include research expectations
  - Including senior and tenured faculty members
2. Under **Metrics**:
  - Other metrics need to be included: e.g., invited lectureships, plenary talks
  - **All existing faculty** should be included in baseline data

# ASPP Committee response to Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education



## Areas of Agreement:

1. Agree with description of **Current State, Principles, and Proposed Goals & Initiatives**
2. GW must widely advertise selection criteria for Distinguished Doctoral Program designation
3. Proposed **Metrics** are doable in the listed timeframes



# ASPP Committee response to Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education



## Areas of Concern:

1. Since last summer, major concern has been that if we would have 10 preeminent graduate programs, what would happen to the remaining graduate programs that are currently thriving at GW—will they wither and die?
  - Addressed only somewhat in the report
  - Need assurances that other programs are not in immediate danger of being closed off
2. Important to make adequate **investments** in graduate education
  - Related to High Impact Research
3. Graduate Education **Quality Criteria** should come from faculty
  - Not from a strategic planning committee

# ASPP Committee response to High-Quality Undergraduate Education



## Least persuasive of the four Interim Reports. Areas of concern:

1. Under **Current State**: “...Science and Engineering Hall has helped to attract and retain STEM undergraduates, *who are now academically on par with non-STEM students*”
  - **Why would STEM majors not be at par with non-STEM majors?**
2. Idealism in **Principles**:
  - Don't agree that every undergrad should engage with “people and institutions in the DC area” (but hopeful that it does happen)
3. Idea of first year experience under Goal 2 already tried and abandoned at GW:
  - **How can first year schedules be rearranged so “these programs are more supportive and increase retention”?**
4. (Im)practicality of Goal 3: “academic credit from **experiential learning opportunities**”?
  - Sounds like what comes from many **for-profit institutions**

**Faculty Committee on University Urban Affairs (UUA)**  
**Response to Interim Strategic Plans**  
**Feb 2020**

On Jan 24, 2020, Sylvia Marotta, Chair of the Executive Committee, shared Interim Strategic Plans via email. She suggested that all chairs of the Senate sub-committees place discussion of these reports on their next meeting agenda. In addition, she asked the committee members to discuss any relevant reports, or portions thereof, as those reports may fall under the purview of your committees. The email suggested, *“It's probably a good idea to discuss what is \*not\* in the reports that your committee thinks should be, as well as what is in them. Each section of the reports should be discussed, including the metrics and available resources in addition to any recommendations.”*

The UUA Committee met on **Feb 10, 2020**. The meeting agenda included a discussion of each one of these reports. Below is a synthesis of the feedback that UUA members shared with UUA Chair.

**Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education**

1. The report speaks to the importance of providing adequate funding to programs and to improving our marketing capabilities, with which we agree. In line with this assertion, some members have expressed concern with evaluating programs based on the number of applicants who apply and the selectivity of the program, as one criterion, when many programs within the universities neither have adequate funding nor market-research that support and advertise our programs. For example, one member noticed that within GSEHD, some degrees are marketed by GSEHD and others are marketed by an external company. It appears that the return on investment is significantly greater from the programs that are marketed by an external partner. Frequent turnover in marketing and admissions positions at GSEHD may have contributed to lack of a consistent marketing plan and vision for many on-ground (as opposed to online) programs over a series of years, resulting in a lack of return from those efforts. Instead, faculty have stepped forward to focus their time on developing partnerships with local districts and on developing marketing materials to share with local potential districts partners. Overall, the criteria for evaluating high quality graduate programs makes sense, however, it also causes major concern as many programs feel that the school and university support in this area has been lacking.
2. Many graduate programs focus on preparing graduates to assume positions outside of academia. One member noted that the report will compare positions of alumni in a variety of fields, but they are concerned about the weight that various positions alumni hold will be given as programs are compared. A program can be very successful in producing graduates who become leaders of large organizations in a variety of fields, however, it is important to consider a variety of criteria (above and beyond their earning, which is historically very low for those who pursue careers in education), such as social impact and social contributions, in comparing alumni across schools and disciplines.

## High Quality Undergraduate Education

1. **Endorse the Undergrad Experience Plan:** We strongly endorse in particular, the plan's Goal 3 and the idea that: Internships, service-learning, and study abroad are central to what GW students do but must be more thoughtfully and deliberately integrated into their educational experience. We would add that linking faculty research and teaching, and being deliberate about supporting learning outcomes for real world learning experiences, will increase their effectiveness. No experience is valuable unless reflection on the experience in the context of academic, civic, or professional outcomes is a part of the experience.

## World Class Faculty

1. Goal 1 relating to Faculty Excellence and Diversity is an important one. Having said that (and given the breadth of diversity from demographic to perspectives and disciplines), it would be crucial for GW to **clearly outline what type of diversity would it seek and retain**. Given the emphasis of interdisciplinary research, **would disciplinary diversity be something that GW emphasize? What about racial, ethnic and gender diversity?**
2. Reports states that the 2019 Colonial Survey indicates faculty dissatisfaction with the intellectual life at GW. However, the report doesn't clearly outline **how it would establish intellectual life for diverse faculty members**. This is critical for developing world class faculty (along with those engaged in high impact research).
3. The report focuses on tenure track and junior faculty members. In the interest of diversity (see above), there should be equal efforts to engage with senior and tenured faculty members. **It is important for GW to adopt inclusive language/ practices that engage all types of faculty in a variety of initiatives outlined in the report.**

## High Impact Research:

1. The report makes several important recommendations related to develop an appropriate infrastructure for high impact research. However, for most part, it doesn't recommend inclusive processes and language. In addition to the junior faculty members, focus should also be placed on senior faculty members to encourage them and to support them in engaging with high quality research. The proposed process of identifying high impact faculty (by working with Deans and Chairs) isn't inclusive enough. It is likely to lead to some hand-picked faculty members-alienating many more. There should be a process in place for faculty members to self-identify themselves.
2. The process of identifying senior leadership for the Research Center (etc.) should be re-evaluated to make it more **inclusive** (see above).

## Overall

1. The strategic plan should consider the relationship among the four goals and ensure that each supports the others.
2. Both HI Research and World Class Faculty propose establishing new centers focused on developing HI research and world class faculty. The goals, purpose, roles and

responsibilities for these centers should be clarified. Questions such as, "how these centers won't add to the existing bureaucracy", 'how these would serve diverse interests of diverse faculty members' and 'how these would adopt inclusive language, practices and processes" should be carefully considered in consultation with GW community.

In 2019-2020, University Urban Affairs (UUA) is charged with the following Committee Mission:

*The Committee on University and Urban Affairs helps foster continued good citizenship between The George Washington University and the greater Washington, DC metropolitan area. The University and Urban Affairs Committee serves as an ongoing catalyst for maximum efficiency in this area and prevents the duplication of effort between GW and the community itself. By affirmatively tracking GW's already allocated resources and initiatives, the University and Urban Affairs Committee "paints the big picture" of GW's community relationship and subsequently provides the University with a valuable source of advice on continuous improvement and possible future endeavors.*

One of the UUA goals included:

**1. Explore ways for the university community to address the rising problem of income inequity and its effects on low income housing and homelessness in DC.**

In lines with the goal above, the UUA members would like to highlight the role GW culture and faculty plays in engaging with the local DC community in a meaningful way. From this perspective, we make the following points:

- 2. Carnegie Community Engagement designation:** An increasing number of universities are focused on becoming engines of social change and/or developing leaders who are civically engaged. In addition, given GW's emphasis on community engagement and our recent recognition from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as a Community Engaged Institution, the Strategic Plans must also delve into strengthening GW's commitment to community engagement. We would like to emphasize that this highly competitive and prestigious designation was awarded, not primarily because GW students engage in direct community service, but because GW as a higher education institution, has embedded community engagement in its identity, practices, policies, and culture. The designation recognizes faculty scholarship and institutional culture of community engagement and research. Faculty exemplars of community engaged research and teaching cited in the materials used to win the designation come from **every** school at GW. Any strategic initiative (moving forward) must commit to strengthening this culture.
- 3. GW's unique context at an international and national crossroads:** The plan, in each category, should consider the context in which GW operates at an international and national crossroads. While we are currently updating our branding and identity, this from [our 2012 standards](#), describes GW well: "Our faculty members are scholars and leading practitioners who bring unique expertise into the classroom, providing students with learning experiences that are rigorous, real time, and real world. Our students believe that one person can make a difference, and the George Washington University encourages them to use their education to make their mark on the world. Whether working through local community initiatives or developing global policies, they are committed to service."

Similarly: “Our location isn’t just where we are, it’s a big part of who we are. Our namesake envisioned a university in the nation’s capital that would prepare citizen leaders brought together from all over the world. . . . Taking full advantage of our setting in a global nerve center, a GW education integrates intellectual discovery, interactive learning, and unparalleled access to opportunities in every sector of society. In a city shaping the future, George Washington is a university where faculty and students not only study the world but also work to change it.” These concepts can and should be updated to reflect our greater embrace of the changes that advances in technology bring. They can be reformulated to reflect the fundamental realignment of the way in which work is done and decisions are made based on AI and other data and technology advancements, including Amazon’s HQ2. At the same time it is important to acknowledge that HQ2 is here because of the preponderance of national and international political and governmental entities in the region.

- 4. Faculty innovation:** Our faculty policies should reflect the research and teaching that is done within the context of persistent inequalities (as found in DC, for example). The products of scholarship may be publicly consumable policy documents, just as they may be a medical breakthrough. At the crossroads of national policymaking, GW has the opportunity and responsibility to recognize that the academic work of our faculty and students are the engines not only of scholarly debate and production, but have the potential to effect politics, policy, and the quality of life in DC and the world. Moreover, GW has the opportunity to become a leader in attracting and supporting a thriving community of scholars from diverse and heretofore un- or under-represented communities. Our world class faculty and thriving graduate students should embrace innovative forms and organization of scholarship. What if GW recruited several multidisciplinary cohorts of faculty to address the next series of wicked problems – and encouraged them to teach and work in partnership with real world partners to test theory and refine scholarship? Is that not one pathway to pre-eminence?

We submit these comments with the objective of strengthening GW’s core culture, its reputation as a world class comprehensive university, the reputation of its diverse programs, and elevating student and faculty experience.

We thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit our response. Please let me know if you have any questions.



## Faculty Senate

### **A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE (20/11)**

**WHEREAS**, the schedule for Senate meetings should provide more predictability to Faculty Senators who need to balance multiple academic and professional commitments;

**WHEREAS**, Faculty Senators may have family responsibilities on a late Friday afternoon; and

**WHEREAS**, open-ended Senate meetings can be onerous for the numerous University staff that serve Senate meetings;

**NOW, THEREFORE**

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

1. That Section 2 of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate be amended by adding as paragraph (g):

"The Senate should normally convene at 2pm and should adjourn at 4:30pm, extending no later than 5pm. A motion to adjourn, if offered, shall require a majority vote as usual. It is the sense of the Senate that members should have a reasonable advance expectation of the latest time that a Senate meeting will adjourn so that members can plan other activities. Members should keep the time of the day in mind in framing their remarks."

2. That Section 2(d) of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate be amended by striking the current text and inserting the following: "The Agenda for a regular meeting shall be available to members in writing on the Senate's website, and a link to that Agenda shall be sent to all members on or before the seventh day before the meeting day."

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate  
February 28, 2020