



Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, December 13, 2019, at 2:10pm
in the State Room (1957 E Street NW).

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on November 8, 2019
3. REPORT: Initiatives to Reduce Undergraduate Enrollment and Increase STEM Majors (Thomas LeBlanc, President)
Per Resolution 20/3, this report includes:
 - A detailed report (including data on enrollment composition and fiscal implications) on the administration's initiatives to reduce the undergraduate population and to increase STEM majors;
 - The rationale for any quantitative goals; and
 - A plan for managing the impact of these initiatives on academic resources and student diversity.
4. REPORT: GW Milken Institute of Public Health Update and Strategic Directions (Lynn Goldman, Dean)
5. REPORTS: Chairs of the Strategic Planning Committees and Related Senate Standing Committees (as recognized: Chairs Christine Barth (Strategic Planning Task Force), Alan Greenberg (High-Impact Research), Scott Kieff (World-Class Faculty), Carol Sigelman (Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education), Gayle Wald, High-Quality Undergraduate Education), Joe Cordes (Senate Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee), Murli Gupta (Senate Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee), Kausik Sarkar (Senate Research Committee), Ed Swaine (Senate Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee), and Jason Zara (Senate Educational Policy & Technology Committee))
6. REPORT: Research Update (Bob Miller, Vice President for Research)
7. DISCUSSION: Assembly-Directed Topics for Senate Discussion (see attached Assembly Petition for discussion of Items 1-5)
8. RESOLUTIONS FROM THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Sylvia Marotta-Walters, Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee):
 - a. RESOLUTION 20/4: To Amend the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate
 - b. RESOLUTION 20/5: To Request the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to Call a Special Meeting of the Faculty Assembly
 - c. RESOLUTION 20/6: To Establish a Special Committee

9. RESOLUTION 20/7: On Involvement of Faculty and Its Elected Representatives in Shaping Strategic Planning (Educational Policy & Technology Committee) (Jason Zara, Chair, Educational Policy & Technology Committee)
10. RESOLUTION 20/8: On Involvement of Faculty and Its Elected Representatives in Shaping Strategic Planning (Research Committee) (Kausik Sarkar, Co-Chair, Educational Policy & Technology Committee)
11. RESOLUTION 20/9: On Shared Governance (Ioannis Eleftherianos, Guillermo Ortí, and Daniel Schwartz, Resolution Co-Authors)
12. Introduction of Resolutions
13. GENERAL BUSINESS
 - a) Nominations for election of new members to Senate standing committees
 - b) Reports of Standing Committees
 - Appointment, Salary, & Promotion Policies Interim Report
 - Athletics & Recreation Interim Report
 - University & Urban Affairs Interim Report
 - c) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Sylvia Marotta-Walters, Chair
 - d) Provost's Remarks
 - e) Chair's Remarks
9. Brief Statements and Questions
10. Adjournment

**Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary**



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 3 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 2012-1019 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)								
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

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. jcj@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



Faculty Senate

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE (20/4)

WHEREAS, Section 10 of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate lists the names of the Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, Section 10 of the Bylaws for the Faculty Senate provides for the establishment of a number of standing committees, in accordance with Article III, Section 5(a) of the Faculty Organization Plan; and

WHEREAS, since 1990, the Faculty Senate has amended Section 10 of the Bylaws on five occasions in order to update the listing of standing committees; and

WHEREAS, it now seems desirable to amend Section 10 of the Bylaws in order to restate the names of the standing committees of the Faculty Senate so that those names will conform to the current practice of the Faculty Senate; **NOW, THEREFORE**

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

1. That Section 10 of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate be amended by removing "Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management";
2. That Section 10 of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate be amended by removing "Faculty Development, Including Academic and Administrative Support"; and
3. That Section 10 of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate be amended by adding "and Technology" to "Educational Policy."

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
November 22, 2019



Faculty Senate

A RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO CALL A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY (20/5)

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

That the Senate requests the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to call a Special Meeting of the Faculty Assembly between January 13, 2020, and January 24, 2020.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
November 22, 2019



A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A SPECIAL COMMITTEE (20/6)

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

1. That the Senate establishes a Special Committee on Matters included in the Faculty Assembly Petition. This Committee is charged with preparing a Report on the first five items of the Petition. The Report is due on January 2, 2020, and shall be placed on the Agenda of the January 10, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting. If the Report is approved by the Faculty Senate, the Report, as endorsed by the Senate, shall be placed on the Agenda of the first Faculty Assembly held after January 10, 2020; and
2. If this Resolution is approved by the Senate, the Senate shall proceed to take nominations or self-nominations of Senate members to serve on this Special Committee. The Senate will then vote to approve the membership of the Special Committee. Following that vote, the Senate will take nominations for the Chair of the Special Committee from among the Faculty serving on the Committee. If more than one nomination is received, the Senate shall vote on the Chair. If no person receives a majority of the votes, the nominee having the lowest number of votes shall be dropped, and the ballot shall be conducted again until a Chair is elected with a majority of the votes of Senate members voting.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
November 22, 2019



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



Faculty Senate

A RESOLUTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE (20/9)

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

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

“With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process;”¹

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

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

WHEREAS, the first of the six items approved by the Assembly at its October 22, 2019 meeting reads “The Assembly directs the Faculty Senate as well as the Senate committees on a) Educational Policy & Technology, b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting, c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and d) Research, to include on each of their respective agendas the following item: *Did the adoption of the strategic plan of increasing the ratio of STEM majors and significantly decreasing undergraduate enrollment properly follow recognized principles of shared governance?*” The Senate and each of the four committees mentioned above (a) Educational Policy & Technology, b) Fiscal Planning & Budgeting and c) Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, and d) Research) shall report the entirety of their findings on the same webpage where the Senate publishes the minutes of its meetings by December 20, 2019 (<https:// facultysenate.gwu.edu/minutes>) and notify

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

each member of the Faculty Assembly of the electronic location of this report that shall remain on the website of the Senate until at least February 15, 2020”;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁵ See appendix A.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁷ See Appendix B

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

Guillermo Ortí
Daniel Schwartz
Ioannis Eleftherianos

19 November 2019

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

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

Charge to the Committee:

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

1. Principles

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

2. Goals

Based on these principles, and in response to the guiding questions below, establish the goals and define specific initiatives to realize the goals.

- High-quality undergraduate student body
- How do we define, recruit, retain, and graduate a high-quality student body?
- Beyond financial aid strategies, what programs, facilities, and experiences should we exploit or develop to attract and retain this high-quality student body?
- High-quality and distinctive undergraduate education
- How do we expand our offerings in STEM education to attract more STEM majors and to provide STEM educational opportunities to all students?
- How do we make the many distinctive educational opportunities available at GW (including the professional schools) accessible to every student?
- How do we use our location to create academic offerings and opportunities that are available at no other institution?

3. Metrics

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

4. Resources

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

APPENDIX B:

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

ACHIEVING 2100 STUDENTS

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

THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, DC

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

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

CONCLUSION

THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

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



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

Interim Report (2019-2020)

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) proposed the following three items for us to consider this year:

- (a) Last year's task was to follow-up on retiree health benefits, including exploring options beyond GWU/Tower. Please provide a report on your activities in this area by the interim reporting period which is due in December.
- (b) Continue to participate in the Salary Equity process begun by the Provost's office and ensure that its regular annual cycle is implemented.
- (c) Explore ways to engage faculty in the fall roll out of the Culture Initiative.

Retiree Health Benefits

We formed a subcommittee including Professors Brian Biles, Susan LaLacheur, David McAleavey, Margaret Plack and Pradeep Rau. This subcommittee has had multiple meetings and have searched a variety of sources to obtain a better understanding of how GW's approach to retirees' health insurance stacks up against that of other universities, in particular against our market basket set of schools.

GW provides a retiree health insurance (RHI) benefit of \$200/month for eight years following a faculty person's retirement. This money is used to defray the cost of healthcare-related expenses; the money is handed over to a third-party organization, VIA, which pays authorized expenses directly and the unused funds carry over to later years. This RHI supplement, which appears to have been in place for more than twenty years, has never been adjusted for inflation. The ASPP committee will consider a proposal to ask GW to increase this amount annually, in line with standard increases to other benefits; and to eliminate the 8-year cut-off rule. This proposal will be considered in the new year and a resolution will possibly then be submitted to FSEC.

Salary equity process update

The Salary Equity Committee under Vice-Provost Bracey, has streamlined the salary equity review process, so that its completion now fits within the annual salary merit review process. Data on rank, department and years in rank were included, such that anyone falling one standard deviation below the mean in their class would be investigated further in cooperation with the deans. This year Medicine and Health

Sciences were not included though Health Sciences faculty will be included in future cycles after it was pointed out that their structure was more like CCAS and less like the MFA. Public Health and Nursing were reviewed: Out of 6 nursing outliers, two were adjusted; Out of 7 Public Health outliers, one was adjusted. The Law School has an ongoing equity evaluation. Vice-Provost Bracey gave a detailed presentation on this topic in November to the Faculty Senate.

Culture Initiative

Many of the faculty members had attended the OurGW events and reported being underwhelmed by this.

Health care costs

We continue to monitor the health care costs and the university contributions towards these costs. As in the past, the health care costs are going up faster (5%) than wages (3%), with inflation around 2% and the employer contributions have not caught up with costs.

Response to Faculty Assembly Resolutions

On an urgent request from FSEC, ASPP Committee members considered the Faculty Assembly Resolutions dated October 6, 2019 and provided our response regarding the proposed reduction in undergraduate enrollments and potential elevation of 10 doctoral programs to national preeminence level. The preliminary version of this document was circulated at the November meeting of Faculty Senate, and a committee response document will be available with the Agenda of the December Senate meeting.

Respectfully Submitted

Murli M. Gupta, Chair, ASPP Committee
December 4, 2019

Faculty Senate Committee on Athletics and Recreation
Interim Report

The Committee met on November 7, 1:00- 2pm.

Attending:

Patrick McHugh (Committee Chair/GWSB Associate Professor of Management)

Hugh Agnew (Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison/Professor of History and International Affairs)

Robert Baker (Program Head of Music & Theatre and Dance/Associate Professor of Music/Advisor, Colonial Brass)

George Glass (Undergraduate Student/GW Student Association/President George's Army)

Mark Hyman (GWSB Assistant Teaching Professor of Management)

Kurt Johnson (Professor of Anatomy and Cell Biology)

Tanya Vogel (Director, Intercollegiate Athletics)

Bev Westerman (Professor of Exercise and Nutrition Sciences, NCAA Faculty Representative on Athletics Council)

Due to an error on the part of the Committee Chair, Beth D. Tuckwiller (GSEHD) and Ashley Darcy-Mahoney (SON) were available but unable to connect to the meeting via a conference call.

Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Student athletes and study abroad participation; what can be done to enhance the ability to participate in study abroad while maintaining their athletic commitments
3. Access to athletics and recreation facilities; what can be done to enhance access to facilities on all campuses
4. Possible items for future meeting topics
5. Any new business

Tanya Vogel reported that the Division of Recreation no longer reports to her.

In order to address the issue of access to athletics and recreation facilities, best to hear from Andre Julien, Senior Associate AD for Health & Wellness, who is an as an ex-officio member of the committee. He reports to Cissy Petty VP of Student Affairs and Dean of Students.

Robert Baker asked about the impact of the university-wide strategic planning process on Intercollegiate Athletics.

Tanya Vogel noted that she has discussed this with President LeBlanc and is in agreement with him regarding the important role of intercollegiate athletics at GW. To quote Vogel, “We are part of the entire university. We have to be part of strategic planning process.”

Vogel noted the importance of aligning the Department of Athletics strategic plan with the overall university strategic plan. She noted that Athletics is an important part of enrollment management and can be a tool to hit enrollment targets. For example, it may be important to know which sports teams have the most STEM majors. Vogel is a member of the High Quality Undergrad Education Committee.

The last Athletics strategic plan was completed in 2012. As President LeBlanc took office, Athletics was encouraged to defer work on a plan until the university-wide plan was completed. Therefore, the Athletic Department plans to engage in a strategic planning process following the conclusion of the university’s overall strategic plan.

Kurt Johnson asked about the role, if any, for this committee in the Athletics strategic planning process.

Tanya Vogel noted that this is an interesting question. How does this committee fit and what role does it play? What do we do with the Athletics Council? Does this committee and the Athletics Council work together?

Discussion then focused on the first agenda item Study Abroad for Intercollegiate athletes.

Tanya Vogel noted an NCAA study indicating that 78 per cent of athletes wish they’d had greater access to Study Abroad. She described challenges for student-athletes seeking to study abroad including: competition and training conflicts during Fall and Spring semesters; in some sports, summer training on campus, general demands of balancing athletics and academics.

Vogel described actions taken by GW Athletics to attempt to accommodate athletes seeking study abroad. Last year, Athletics worked with the study abroad office and the department of sociology to create a one-credit study abroad course. Broad parameters: Home stays abroad, come back and do follow up work on campus. Approved late last school year. This program will run for the first time in Spring/Summer 2020 to Vietnam. Fifteen students have expressed interest. There is strong donor interest in supporting these study abroad experiences for student athletes, thus fundraising for these initiatives is promising.

She also noted that GW Athletics does not provide athletic scholarships (aid) during study-abroad semesters. This GW policy, is similar to many other Division 1 programs.

Members of the committee pointed out the deterrence effect of this kind of policy on facilitating study abroad for scholarship athletes in particular.

Patrick McHugh asked whether the Athletics Department has benchmarked itself on study abroad policies at other schools – particularly those in the A-10? It would be valuable to get information on how other schools in the A-10 provide support to encourage student athletes and study abroad both in terms of policies and the percentages of student athletes that complete a study abroad experience.

Additional helpful information would include: How many student athletes are here at GW? How many study abroad? How many scholarship athletes at GW? How many scholarship athletes study abroad?

Tanya Vogel indicated that GW Athletics will follow up with data and additional info.

Patrick McHugh noted that this data would be helpful in terms of understanding the current status, and if initiatives are put in place, how effective they have been in terms of advancing student athlete participation in study abroad.

George Glass asked about the number of hours that student athletes commit to sports in and out of season. Vogel explained “countable hours” vs. “real commitment” which can be much more.

Mark Hyman noted that some GW sports teams travel abroad for competition and exhibition games. There’s precedent for building courses around such trips. A course on The Business of Sports – Japan was open to basketball players and general student population during the men’s basketball team trip in Summer of 2016. This is another model for creating study abroad opportunities for student athletes.

Members of the committee seemed to agree that a multi-faceted approach with different options is perhaps the best way to expand study abroad options for student athletes. The Vietnam program is one model that if successful, could be expanded to other time periods, other abroad locations, and other disciplinary areas to better accommodate different sport schedules.

Patrick McHugh suggested some possible future agenda items/topics for the committee:

- a) Access to athletics and recreation facilities; what can be done to enhance access to facilities on all campuses?
- b) College admissions scandal and GW athletics program responses and actions
- c) Name, image and likeness compensation for college athletes and implications for GW

The Faculty Senate Standing Committee on University Urban Affairs (UUA)
Interim Report 2019-2020

Submitted by: Shaista E. Khilji, Professor of Human and Organizational Learning & International Affairs

In Summer 2019, UUA was reconstituted with several new members under the leadership of a new Chair, Shaista E. Khilji. Throughout the Fall semester, new members have been added to the roster.

Current UUA Members include:

- Shaista Khilji, Chair (GSEHD)*
- Jeff Gutman, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison (LAW)*
- Oluwatomi Adetunji (SEAS)
- Linda Cassar (SON)
- Jillian Catalanotti (SMHS)
- Amy Cohen (CCAS)
- Sarah Frasure (SMHS)
- Ina Gjikondi (CPS Staff)
- Matthew Hess (SON Staff)
- Karen Kesten (SON)
- Samantha Luna (CPS Staff)
- Angela McConnell (SMHS)
- Dave Milzman (SMHS)
- Stacia Moreno (SON)
- Damali Nakitende (SMHS)
- Anne-Marie O'Brien (SON)
- David Rain (CCAS)*
- Dan Schwartz (CCAS)*
- Rebecca Thessin (GSEHD)
- Margaret Venzke (SON)
- Jillian Wolons (GW Student Association)

*Faculty Senators

Committee Mission states:

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.

The FSEC also identified the following goals for UUA:

1. Continue annual planning of programs to bring university faculty and administrators together with DC Government, citizen groups, and members of the Foggy Bottom community.
2. 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.

Committee Actions (Fall Semester 2019):

The Committee scheduled to meet once a month for the 2019-2020 academic year. Members have already met in Sept, Oct and Nov 2019.

Below is a snap shot of the ongoing activities that relate to aforementioned Committee Mission and goals:

- *Tracking GW's resources and initiatives to paint the big picture (Committee Mission):*
 - Committee members discussed the many challenges associated with tracking GW's resources and initiatives (for example, silos, ineffective communication, sometimes information overload, and absence of a central repository system), however, they also highlighted the importance of creating a centralized and coordinated database of GW's community engagement initiatives and events.
 - The Committee members crafted a new question, that could be included in the Lyterati system. We believe that this question would allow all GW faculty members to directly input their community engagement activities in the reporting system.
 - We have spoken with the Provost Office, and hope to present the question for possible inclusion in the Faculty Lyterati system. Refer to the proposed question in Appendix A.
 - The Committee Chair reached out the custodian of GW Calendar. She is awaiting confirmation of a meeting to discuss possibilities of using the GW Calendar to identify GW community engagement activities, capture additional activities that may, otherwise, be going unreported.
 - UUA Members would disseminate GW Serve link and information among their colleagues to improve communication between GW faculty, students and DC community partners.
 - If supported, these actions can collectively assist GW administration with capturing the 'big picture' of GW resources through targeted reporting and better coordination of all activities at GW.
- *Planning of program to bring GW faculty, administrators with DC government, citizen groups and members of the FB community (Goal 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 (Goal 2):*

- Based on member discussions/ interests and a careful review of goals 1 and 2, UUA has identified 3 projects for 2019-2020:
 - **Project 1- Housing Summit** at GW (led by Ina Gjokondi- CPS and Amy Cohen- CCAS): We are planning to co-host a housing summit in partnership with the DC Dept of Housing and Community Engagement. Expected to be held in Jan 2020 at GW.
 - **Project 2- University Seminar on “Advancing an Interdisciplinary View of Inequality”** (led by Anne-Marie O’Brien- SON): We are planning to submit a proposal for University Seminar funding. Due Date: June 2020.
 - **Project 3- Inequality Awareness Project** (led by Shaista E. Khilji- GSEHD): We are planning to organize a panel discussion focusing on the causes and impact of inequality. This event would be open to GW students and the wider DC community. Expected to be held in Jan 2020.

Please direct all inquiries to UUA Chair- Prof. Shaista E. Khilji at sekhilji@gwu.edu

Reviewed by: UUA Members

Appendix A Proposed Lyterati Question

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching describes Community Engagement as the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national and global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

Please list any teaching, research, and/ or service you have done with GW that meets the aforementioned definition of community engagement. Please make sure to provide name(s) of the partner organization(s) and describe any products of that activity.