
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

REGULAR FACULTY ASSEMBLY

October 22, 2019

Jack Morton Auditorium & Innovation 102/VSTC

CALL TO ORDER

President LeBlanc called the Assembly to order at 4:09pm and welcomed the attendees, particularly the new faculty members in attendance, to this regular meeting of the Faculty Assembly held each fall. He also welcomed those faculty members participating from the remote location at the Virginia Science and Technology Campus (VSTC). At the end of today's Assembly, the University will host a reception at the Foggy Bottom location.

The President noted that, on Sunday, October 6, he received a petition from 23 faculty asking to place an item on the agenda of this Assembly. He accepted the petition and has included it as Item 8 on the Agenda for this afternoon. The President further noted that he understands that some of the petitioners have indicated that they may seek Assembly approval to change the order of the agenda to re-locate the discussion of the petition to occur right after the Introduction of New Faculty. The Parliamentarian has indicated to the petitioners that they may seek recognition following the new faculty introductions to offer such a motion. This will be considered as a debatable motion that can be adopted by a majority vote.

The Faculty Organization Plan directs the President, as Chair, to prepare the agenda for the Assembly. In conjunction with Professor Sylvia Marotta-Walters, the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the President decided to place the business item of the petition at the end of the agenda after the President, the Provost, and the Senate Executive Committee Chair have had an opportunity to present their remarks. He expressed their belief that the recent developments to be discussed in these reports are of concern to all faculty, and that these presentations will provide valuable information and context for the matters that are raised in the petition.

The President noted that, in accordance with the custom of his presidency, he will be happy to answer questions after his remarks. Provost Maltzman and FSEC Chair Marotta-Walters will also be able to answer questions after their remarks. Each of these three reports from university and faculty leadership will provide ample opportunity for faculty to ask particular questions about the strategic planning process or other important issues. He noted that he as well as the Provost and the FSEC Chair look forward to faculty questions.

The Parliamentarian has advised the President that Item 8, the consideration of the petition, cannot be a question and answer session.

At the appropriate time, the President will recognize a faculty member in favor of the petition to begin debate on the petition and its subparts. Following the debate, the Chair will call for a vote of eligible faculty on the petition. This will be a majority vote tabulated by tellers who will count the

raised green cards that have been issued to voting-eligible members of the Assembly. A simple majority will be needed to adopt the resolutions in the petition.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular Faculty Assembly held on October 24, 2018, were approved as distributed.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW FACULTY

New faculty members present from the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (CCAS), the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS), the Law School, the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences (SEAS), the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD), the School of Business (GWSB), the Elliott School of International Affairs (ESIA), the Milken Institute School of Public Health (GWSPH), the College of Professional Studies (CPS), and the School of Nursing (SON) introduced themselves and were welcomed by the Assembly.

Professor Griesshammer moved to reorder the agenda to consider the petition at this point in the Assembly, prior to the administration's remarks, to allow the Assembly more time for a comprehensive and measured discussion of the petition that is not rushed due to attendees' time constraints at the end of the meeting. An objection was noted to the motion. In light of the objection, a vote was required to amend the agenda and move item 8. Professor Griesshammer moved to amend the call to vote on the motion; this motion was seconded. The motion passed by majority vote count.

FACULTY PETITION FOR ASSEMBLY AGENDA ITEMS

Professor Griesshammer spoke for the petition, noting that it is a request for information and that there is no ill intent behind it. The petitioners request data, logic, and rationale as well as intended and unintended consequences of the ideas underpinning the strategic planning process now underway. Once this information has been gathered, the petitioners request the opportunity, at a future meeting, to consider the full process in light of that information. The information requested through the petition is complicated and will require some time, effort, and consideration by other entities at the university to collect; it cannot be provided orally at today's meeting.

The administration has unique access to information that speaks to the budget, reputation, diversity, and health of the university as an institution in view of a planned 20% reduction in the undergraduate population and a planned increase in STEM emphasis (as well as other issues). The petitioners ask that the administration share this data with faculty so that faculty input and decision can be informed with data. Because the administration has unique information and unique access to that information, it is surprising that the first and only cost/benefit analysis to date of the enrollment proposition did not come from the administration but rather from Professor Joe Cordes, Chair of the Senate Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee, at the September 2019 Faculty Senate meeting. His findings and analysis do not appear to be challenged by the administration.

A motion was made from the floor for a division of the question (to separate the petition into six questions); the motion was seconded. The motion failed to achieve the required simple majority, and debate continued on the petition as a whole.

Professor Griesshammer continued by noting that a speculative picture of the enrollment plan (speculative as data has not yet been provided) based on Professor Cordes's Senate presentation, President LeBlanc's stated reference to an annual \$64 million budget gap created by the plan, and the typical admissions profile at GW points to a current incoming STEM class at GW of 610 students annually (based on a class of 2550 students annually), or 24% of the population. Increasing this percentage to 30% of a smaller overall enrollment would result in an increase of approximately 20 STEM students. Most of these students are enrolled in the Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (CCAS), and many are following a pre-med course of study. One issue the university faces is that STEM students typically receive a higher discount rate than non-STEM students. Increasing the number of STEM students would hence decrease tuition revenue. A number of enrollment impacts can be expected: the number of female students would increase (from about 63% to 67%), the number of non-Asian students of color would decrease (from about 23% to 15%), the number of Pell-eligible students would decrease (from about 15% to 10%), and the number of international students would decrease (from about 15% to 10%). All of these numbers depend on the exact scenario being run, but, under a \$64 million budget gap scenario, these are the effects the university can expect to realize. A robust discussion needs to occur around whether this decrease in diversity is something to which the university aspires. The practical result would be that STEM faculty will teach a few more students with fewer resources as the university accounts for the budget gap. Professor Griesshammer further noted that it is unclear whether the \$64 million figure takes into account the decreased housing revenue GW would realize as a result of this plan. The budget gap definitely does not take into account needed investments in renovations, the student experience, student-teacher ratios, research, and in teaching.

At present, Professor Griesshammer noted, the faculty do not have the data required to discuss these changes and their consequences in a meaningful way. It appears that the university is meant to accomplish more with less, but it is not clear how this will work. This translates to concerns about the health of the university, as faculty have also been told that there is no pressing need to change the revenue model at GW. Professor Griesshammer noted that he is himself a STEM faculty member and is in favor of more STEM at the university. However, he is uncertain that the combination of an increase in STEM enrollments with a reduction in undergraduate enrollment will strengthen the university. He closed by noting that the six points in the petition represent requests for information to be gathered and analyzed by the relevant Senate committees and brought back to the Assembly for discussion.

A member of the Assembly asked why, if the administration does not object to providing this information, the process cannot move forward with the information available. The President, on advice from the Parliamentarian, reiterated that Q&A is not permitted as part of the debate on the petition but noted that he would address this during his remarks.

Professor Cordes confirmed that he made a presentation to the Faculty Senate in September 2019; that presentation included an estimate of the fiscal impact of the reduction in undergraduate and increase in STEM enrollments might be. Roughly speaking, the numbers are as Professor Griesshammer indicated; specifically, at least under one scenario (including the impact on auxiliary service revenue, which includes housing), the university would realize a \$64-70 million budget gap. While supporting the resolution, Professor Cordes noted that Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer Mark Diaz was very willing to review and comment on this high-level analysis. The next-level analysis is not as easily or publicly available, and more cooperation from the administration is

required to access the deeper data required for more detailed work. Professor Cordes interprets the current petition as a way of ensuring that this cooperation will happen going forward. In addition to the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting committee, Professor Cordes noted that the Educational Policy & Technology committee is also involved in the work of assessing program impacts. He reiterated his support for the petition as an information-gathering mechanism.

Professor Chapman noted that information is important but that it is also important that the faculty exercise its right and responsibility of shared governance as faculty. She expressed her view that, throughout the strategic planning and enrollment change processes, faculty have not been consulted. She expressed her support for the petition, noting that it is important to slow down the process and provide a mechanism for the Senate and its committees to address the petition's elements and report back to the faculty. At that point, the faculty should be permitted to vote on whether it wants to move forward with the process. The required information is available but hasn't been gathered, assessed, and conveyed to the faculty in a way that makes sense.

Professor Lubkemann spoke to clarify what the petition requests. Its request for information goes beyond a fiscal question and the financial health of the university to the logic behind the particular shift being proposed. Specifically, information is being requested on who has been consulted, who was involved in planning, what will ensure GW's health and reputation, and what the data are behind the plan that supports the idea that the plan will move GW forward. The petition requests this broad kind of information and for faculty participation in decision-making processes.

Professor Psek noted that these debates should hold GW's students at their center. It is important to keep that focus and consider the time this process takes while students are trying to learn and grow at the university,

Professor Tielsch appreciated the stated concerns about enrollment reductions but noted that he didn't recall similar concerns about shared governance being raised when enrollments were increased in recent years. He wondered whether shared governance was a part of the decision to increase enrollment, including a discussion of the financial and "right-size" wisdom of that move.

Professor Wirtz responded to this point, noting that the faculty has spent years looking at the effects of increased enrollments on diversity, student quality, and other areas. This question is taken up in the Educational Policy & Technology committee every year, and the committee has actively considered it with the Provost's office and with enrollment management. In his view, the current petition results from the fact that, while faculty have been actively involved in all important educational policy decisions up to this point (including those around enrollment increases and discount rate setting), the Educational Policy & Technology committee received no communication about the current plans to adjust the discount rate and decrease undergraduate enrollment. This represents a major change in the approach taken to such questions. Professor Wirtz expressed his solid support of the petition to prevent GW from reverting to its previous "rich, white kid school" status.

Professor Levy noted that he is undecided about the petition, expressing his view that one of the challenges results from the way the debate has been constructed. Specifically, the spirit of the petition is to obtain as much information as possible, but the gathered faculty have not been allowed to hear from the administration how it feels about the petition prior to the debate on the petition. He would like to know what the administration will commit to in order to make this a more

collaborative process. He moved to suspend debate and proceed with the administration's reports, and then return to debate on petition. The motion was seconded. A vote on the motion failed to achieve the required two-thirds majority.

A motion to end debate on the petition was offered and seconded. The motion passed, achieving the required two-thirds majority.

A vote on the petition was called. The Assembly voted to accept the petition.

REMARKS AND Q&A: THOMAS LEBLANC, UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

The President began his remarks with a focus on the strategic planning process, noting that it is clearly a priority consideration for the attending faculty. The four strategic planning committees are all faculty-led, and a university-wide committee includes trustee, faculty, alumni, and student representation. Membership information for all the committees is available online, and all the committees are meeting. The President encouraged the faculty to participate in the public discussions being held by each committee. He noted that the administration is providing all requested information to the committees; this includes models and fiscal estimates done in anticipation of the process and these discussions.

The President placed the STEM goal in context, noting that, prior to the construction of the Science and Engineering Hall seven years ago, GW was not very competitive in the STEM market. At that point in time, GW and Georgetown were the low-end outliers in STEM majors with about 10% of students completing a STEM major (with MIT and CalTech at the high end, around 98%).

Decisions made prior to President LeBlanc's arrival were statements of GW's serious investment in the arts (the acquisition of the Corcoran) and in STEM (the construction of Science and Engineering Hall). The President noted that he respects the fact that the university was built on the strength of its humanities and social sciences fields. However, the world has changed, and students are asking for more STEM integration into their programs of study, in part because they recognize that it will make them more attractive on the job market. He reported that an organic demand for STEM came first not from science majors but from students in the Elliott School of International Affairs (ESIA), where students had to pursue a dual degree rather than a second major in order to work on a STEM major, due to the fact that ESIA only offered a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree. New this year is a Bachelor of Science (BS) degree in ESIA, allowing students to pursue a second major in a STEM field. Student demand has also driven increased coursework in Python literacy, teaching students to analyze data with technology. Washington, DC, is a technology town now, and making more STEM education available to students seems like the right thing to do, regardless of their majors.

Prior to the opening of the Science and Engineering Hall, 11% of students pursued STEM majors. Now, that number is 18-19% of students (with first or second majors in a STEM field). Identifying GW's place in STEM education requires defining STEM. One way to do so is to use the Homeland Security definition of the term, which provides an agreed-upon methodology and therefore permits comparison with other universities. The university is specifically interested in increasing the number of students who complete a STEM major (not the fraction of incoming students who indicate an interest in STEM). GW does not have 100% retention in STEM and sees about a 6% departure rate from STEM majors. Therefore, graduating 30% of students with STEM majors means admitting a

higher number than that initially as well as improving retention in STEM majors. The President noted that the 30% goal comes from the fact that 30% is the next lowest band of peer academic institutions beyond GW and Georgetown with regard to the proportion of STEM students. He further noted that this is not an extreme goal for GW to attain.

The president shared his thoughts on five ways this might be done, noting that the committee will make recommendations on these ways and others: 1) modest growth in engineering; 2) modest growth in the basic sciences in arts and sciences; 3) grow new programs; 4) strengthen the traditional pre-med program; and 5) add STEM second majors to the traditionally strong population that studies the social sciences.

The President affirmed that the STEM student discount rate is higher than the non-STEM student discount rate. The value proposition of GW for STEM students seven years ago was not very strong. The opening of the Science and Engineering Hall has dramatically changed this; it takes investment to bring STEM students to the university. GW should be able to lower the discount rate by increasing the value proposition of studying STEM at GW. He expressed his desire not to minimize the importance of STEM retention, noting that many STEM fields have for too long held a “filter-out” mentality, discouraging students who are struggling from continuing. However, STEM work is too important to the country and to GW to allow this mentality to continue. Retention, particularly of minority students, needs to be improved. He stated that GW’s diversity will not decrease one iota because of this effort, emphasizing that the Board of Trustees chair made this same assurance at the October 2019 Faculty Senate meeting.

The President recognized that the concern around STEM isn’t as large as the concern around changes in the undergraduate enrollment. Importantly, though, increasing STEM at GW will be good for GW because it will broaden the group of students drawn to GW—both STEM majors and social science majors who recognize the important role STEM now plays in their fields. There will be a time when fewer people want to study GW’s traditionally strong social science fields. The university needs to be ready for that time with strong, broad offerings; the university also needs to ensure that students across all fields who are saying they want these skills have access to them at GW.

President LeBlanc turned to the undergraduate enrollment issue, noting that, upon his arrival, he heard a clear directive to focus on the student experience. While some fixes were relatively easy (e.g., Thurston Hall renovations), it became clear that small changes weren’t getting to the essence of the student experience. In addition to a crowded residential campus, the President relayed that GW’s course registration is known among students as the Hunger Games due to the intense competition to get into the courses they want to take—and courses are the basic value proposition GW offers. Student services—especially the financial aid office and counseling services—are also overburdened.

The President reported that GW has a 20% yield rate, which means that 4 out of 5 admitted students turn down GW. The university receives around 27,000 undergraduate applications annually. About 12,000 of these are viewed as not being of the quality the faculty expect. From the remaining 15,000 GW needs to admit 11,500 of them to attain an entering class of 2650 students. This is the picture the university faces in a strong economy. The President stressed that GW is too good a place to be vulnerable to external forces such as the economy and politics and needs to think carefully about how to get ahead of these shifts.

Frequent articles in higher education reporting discuss the looming admissions problem, and President LeBlanc reported that some excellent schools are not meeting their enrollment targets. It is not difficult to see what's coming at a national level, which is a drop in undergraduate populations. Interest in GW can be grown by having a broader portfolio with first-rate STEM opportunities as well as by shrinking its demand for students. The President stressed that enrollment will not be shrunk by 20% in a single year. Reducing enrollment by a small amount each year for five years will realize the overall goal. As this progresses, the President noted that the university reserves the right to be rational; if the outside world changes, GW should adapt its plan accordingly.

GW's admissions process is very complex, and the university learns something each year. Diversity, the discount rate, and demographics are all in GW's admissions models, and every aspect of the admissions process is up to the university. GW's admissions models for a smaller undergraduate student body don't assume any compromise on diversity; at a minimum, the university wants at least a diverse a student body as it has today. The President noted that every admissions variable (e.g., gender diversity) represents a decision the university makes. He noted that reducing the size of the student body gets at the core of the issues the students want to see fixed. These are not issues with their interactions with the faculty but rather with their ability to access courses.

The President noted that one financial benefit of the enrollment reduction plan is the cancellation of a planned \$40 million residence hall. The plan was simply not required in the face of planned lower enrollments. A second financial move was the cancellation of the fixed tuition policy. This plan held a student's first-year tuition flat for four years. The motivations for the plan were to provide certainty to families and to counter the negative publicity around being the most expensive university in the country. The latter is no longer true (GW is now ranked 59th in terms of the first-year cost of attendance), and the former was not being realized as families' overall cost of attendance was going up due to increasing costs in housing and other non-tuition expenses. GW is no longer realizing the value of this policy, and, therefore, it makes sense to stop financial expenditures that aren't productive for GW today. The President was clear that GW has run many models on this—a lack of specificity now reflects the fact that progress toward these plans will need to remain flexible as the plans proceed.

Over the past five years, the President noted, GW has added 1000 students through three main avenues: 1) the Corcoran School of the Arts acquisition; 2) retention improvements under Provost Maltzman (for the first time in its history, GW has had five consecutive years of better than 80% graduation rates); and 3) maintaining the additional 400 undergraduate students admitted during a time of declining graduate credit hours (2012-2014) past the point when graduate enrollments returned to previous levels.

President LeBlanc noted that a 10% reduction in undergraduate enrollment would have taken GW back to where it was five years ago. As 2014 was not a golden era for GW, the message the President received was that more than this needed to be done. He reiterated that this is a five-year plan that will be implemented through annual decisions fed by what's happening in the world.

The President affirmed that the strategic planning process is not a planning exercise for its own sake. Rather, it is trying to do something over the next five years that will move GW into its third century and make it stronger. He noted that he welcomes conversation around and throughout the process and will share all available data with the committees. He further stated that he understands the anxiety around a reduced resource base but indicated that the university community needs to

understand that the path forward can't be the same as the path that brought the university to the present day; that path is capped now.

Professor Lubkemann agreed that we live in a world that has changed in dramatic ways and that STEM is now a vital piece of many non-traditionally STEM academic fields. He noted some slippage in one of the President's observations. Specifically, there is a difference between introducing STEM components into non-traditional STEM disciplines and increasing the number of STEM majors; these are two different models. He asked whether there is survey data of students indicating they want additional STEM education opportunities as opposed to the opportunity to pursue second majors in STEM fields. There may be a reason that GW and Georgetown are prominent outliers in the STEM major arena.

The President responded that every GW student needs to have access to the skills that teach them to analyze quantitative data with technology. This is separate from STEM majors in particular. He reported that ESIA students, attending a dinner with the President, suggested that STEM enhancements to their education could be accomplished by hiring ESIA faculty who dabble in STEM fields. They didn't want pure STEM education, but the President reported his certainty that this would not be acceptable to faculty in the STEM disciplines and that the answer to a desire for more STEM education was simply to provide more STEM education. The measurement of increased STEM majors could be a count of both first and second majors. Student feedback has demonstrated a demand for STEM majors (although this data was not obtained via a formal survey). Now that the ESIA BS degree has been implemented, the university will monitor its use and effectiveness. The President affirmed that, based on his interactions with students, there is an organic demand for this type of coursework that is coupled with students looking for communities where STEM is part of the discourse.

Professor Wood expressed his sense that the large attendance at today's Assembly reflects a concern not only with Professor LeBlanc's decisions but also with his style of administration. He stated that the President lost an opportunity today to listen to the faculty and urged the President to engage in more dialogue with the faculty.

A faculty member noted that both Howard University and Catholic University are in Washington, DC, and have engineering schools. The University of Maryland also has an engineering school. He asked why the President did not consider them in his comments about engineering at GW. The President responded that this is a fair point; he noted that he was referring to the universities with the largest overlap in their applicant pools.

REMARKS: FORREST MALTZMAN, PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

The Provost began his final remarks to the annual Faculty Assembly by quoting from George Washington's farewell address. He noted that his last day as Provost is November 1, 2019, at which point Brian Blake will begin his tenure as Provost. Provost Maltzman has known Dr. Blake for about seven years and is very enthusiastic about his arrival.

The Provost expressed his enthusiasm for the conversation held at the Assembly today. These issues are critical, and it is important that the faculty hold the administration accountable in the interest of protecting the university's future.

Provost Maltzman stressed that it is critical to think about the financial stress GW students endure every day. Professor Cordes's analysis built in a fairly substantial cut to the financial aid program. If the cut in enrollment is simply with that mechanism, then there is concern that the university will retrench itself on diversity and/or the quality of its students. A less dense campus will improve the student experience, but the university should not neglect the fact that it currently meets only about 80% of the need of its students.

The Provost noted that he is proud of his office's accomplishments over the past eight years. GW's students are better in quality, and are graduating at a higher rate, and GW's research is extremely strong. He expressed his hope that he had something to do with these successes but noted that he had a great deal of help along the way. He acknowledged the deans as his partners over the years as well as his team of vice provosts and senior leadership in the Office of the Provost, all of whom have been critical in moving the institution forward. He noted that GW is a better institution as a result of the variety of perspectives the faculty and administration bring to the equation every day. He also thanked the faculty, noting that one of any Provost's most critical relationships is the one with the faculty. He noted that the graduation rate is the best single measure the university has of how it's doing as an institution. This work required careful analysis at the individual department level, and that work involved the faculty at every level. The United States has the best higher ed system in the world, the Provost noted, in large part because of the strong role of shared governance. This collaboration can be challenging, but it is how institutions are strengthened.

The Provost opined that he has excellent taste in hiring but hoped that he would never be somewhere where he was responsible for all the hiring. A strong university needs a diversity of cultures and viewpoints.

Finally, the Provost thanked his favorite colleague, his spouse, Professor Sarah Binder, for her support of his work through many long hours. The Assembly honored Provost Maltzman with a standing ovation.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE: PROFESSOR SYVIA MAROTTA-WALTERS, CHAIR, FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Marotta-Walters noted that Senate activities over the past year are available on the Senate website. She also encouraged all new faculty to read the recently revised *Faculty Code*, which is a valuable and critical document for all faculty.

She spoke to shared governance, affirming her belief in and practice of it. She encouraged all her colleagues to participate in it. She expressed that the petition accepted by the Assembly today is an excellent example of shared governance. It raises some very interesting points and points out some things that the Faculty Senate is already doing.

Specifically, Professor Marotta-Walters urged the President early on in the strategic planning process to engage in two-way, ongoing communication with the faculty throughout the planning process, as the faculty are the ones who work with the students (those who are most directly affected by actions emanating from the planning process). Strategic planning is not static; it is an ongoing process and needs to evolve and be flexible as necessary. In August, Professor Marotta-Walters noted the same to Board of Trustees Chair Grace Speights. Chair Speights addressed the Faculty

Senate in October 2019, and committed to the ongoing faculty review of the strategic planning committees' work and work products. This position has been validated by President LeBlanc. Professor Marotta-Walters noted that she brought the same message to Trustee Barth, the chair of the university-wide strategic planning committee, who agreed that the faculty's ongoing voice is key to making any planning process work.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) will meet on Friday, October 25, and will discuss the Assembly petition and how best to proceed in light of the faculty's having adopted it. Professor Marotta-Walters noted that the final point in the petition regarding an additional Assembly in January 2020, won't work, as it comes too late in the process. Meaningful work cannot be done at that point, given that the Board will meet in early February to review the plan.

Professor Marotta-Walters highlighted the research committee as an excellent example of how the planning process and shared governance are working well together. At the September 2019 Faculty Senate meeting, a Senator suggested using the results of the research ecosystem assessment done last year as part of the strategic planning committee on research; this suggestion was accepted and is making for a stronger strategic planning committee as a result. The Vice President for Research will also report to the Senate earlier than usual this year in order to inform the strategic planning process with input from that Senate meeting.

Professor Marotta-Walters emphasized that the work of the Senate happens in its committees, and she encouraged faculty to join committees whenever possible. When not possible, she asked that faculty monitor the Senate's activities on its website and also continue to do what they have done at today's Assembly.

A member of the Assembly noted that participation is important and that many faculty made special arrangements to be at the meeting today. This was possible because the Assembly agenda was communicated early enough for faculty to make arrangements to attend. The strategic planning town halls aren't seeing the same levels of participation because they are not being held with adequate notice. She asked that more notice of these events be given to maximize faculty participation. Professor Marotta-Walters agreed that these were valid points and that as the committees continue their work, their schedules should be provided with advance notice.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:02pm.

6 October 2019

As stated in the Faculty Code, faculty may petition to add items to the Assembly Agenda and the Assembly may direct the Faculty Senate.

<https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/blogs.gwu.edu/dist/0/196/files/2019/02/Faculty-Organization-Plan-v3-2017-z76h5u.pdf>

Article 2. section 3. Part A.
SECTION 3. MEETINGS

(a) A regular meeting of the Assembly shall be held at least once during the academic year. 1 A regular meeting may be called by the President, by request of the Senate, or by the petition of twenty or more members of the Assembly; and **the agenda as prepared by the President shall include any matter requested by the Senate or the Executive Committee of the Senate, or by petition of fifteen or more members of the Assembly.** The call of a regular meeting shall contain the time, place, and agenda of the meeting; and it shall be mailed not later than the tenth day preceding the day of the meeting.

And Article 2, section 4.2.
Functions of the assembly:

..."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."

Accordingly, we the undersigned request the following six (6) items be placed on the agenda of the regular 2019 meeting of the Faculty Assembly.

1. 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.

2. 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 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?”* Given answers to these questions, the Senate and each of the four committees mentioned above shall evaluate the return on investment for monies spent on the Culture Initiative. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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 items: *“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?" 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.

5. 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.

6. The Assembly directs the Chair of the Senate Executive Committee to call a special meeting of the Assembly between January 13, 2020 and January 24, 2020. The Agenda of that Assembly meeting shall include reports from the Senate and its committees to questions 1-5 above and the Assembly shall vote to approve or reject in separate votes.

Signatories:

1. Guillermo Orti, Dept. of Biological Sciences. gorti@gwu.edu
2. Jamie Cohen-Cole, Dept. of American Studies. jcohencole@gwu.edu
3. Bernard Wood, Dept. of Anthropology. bernardawood@gmail.com
4. Sarah Wagner, Dept. of Anthropology. sewagner@email.gwu.edu
5. Ivy Ken, Dept. of Sociology, ivyleighken@gmail.com
6. Harald Griesshammer, Dept. of Physics. hgrie@gwu.edu

7. Katrin Schulteiss, Dept. of History. k.schultheiss9@gmail.com
8. Michael Barnett, International Affairs and Political Science. barnett@gwu.edu
9. Catherine Forster, Dept. of Biological Sciences, Prog. Geological Sciences. forster@gwu.edu
10. Gregory D. Squires, Dept. of Sociology. squires@email.gwu.edu
11. Melani McAlister, Dept. of American Studies & International Affairs. mmc@gwu.edu
12. Andrew Zimmerman, Dept. of History. azimmer@gwu.edu
13. Katherine Kleppinger, French and Francophone Studies. kleppinger@email.gwu.edu
14. Christopher Britt, Spanish and Latin American Studies. cbritt@gwu.edu
15. Dara Orenstein, Dept. of American Studies. dorenstein@gwu.edu
16. Erin Chapman, Dept. of History. echapman@gwu.edu
17. Masha Belenky, French Literature Program. belenky@gwu.edu
18. Katherine Larsen, University Writing Program. klarsen@gwu.edu
19. Kelly Pemberton, Religion, Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. kpembert@gwu.edu
20. Jennifer James, Dept. of English. jjc@gwu.edu
21. Thomas A. Guglielmo, Dept. of American Studies. tgugliel@gwu.edu
22. Sara Matthiesen, Dept. of History. sara_matthiesen@email.gwu.edu
23. Joanna Spear, Elliott School of International Affairs. jspear@gwu.edu