

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.

SPECIAL FACULTY ASSEMBLY  
February 25, 2020  
Jack Morton Auditorium & Innovation 101/VSTC

CALL TO ORDER

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair Sylvia Marotta-Walters called the Assembly to order at 4:05pm. She welcomed the assembled group and noted that, in order to ensure there is sufficient time for a hearty discussion of the final agenda item, she would move the agenda along to begin discussion of that agenda item by 5:00pm.

UPDATE ON THE FUTURE ENROLLMENT TASK FORCE/PROVOST BRIAN BLAKE

Provost Blake reported that he has established and is chairing a Future Enrollment Task Force with representation from the faculty, the administration, and the student body to look at the implementation options for the 20/30 plan. This task force has worked very closely with the strategic planning committee on High-Quality Undergraduate Education (chaired by Professor Gayle Wald). That committee has a broader focus than the task force; their interim report Goal 6 relates most closely to the task force's work.

The task force met initially in December and has now met five times; it consists of deans (from the Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (CCAS), the School of Engineering & Applied Science, the Elliott School of International Affairs (ESIA), and the School of Nursing), three faculty members (from CCAS and ESIA), a student, and a staff member. The task force is working on mechanizing the 20/30 strategy with a focus on what the academic experience for students five to ten years from now should be as opposed to specific finances or targets. The task force has worked to identify several cross-cutting themes to this end and has met with the strategic planning committee on High-Quality Undergraduate Education to look at how these themes align with the broader strategic planning work being undertaken at the university. The themes do not necessarily connect directly to STEM but will interact with each other in ways that will impact STEM at GW.

Some of the thematic areas evolving from this work include security policy and international affairs; the interpretation of unstructured data; social media and political discourse; politics, society, and the sciences; preventive medicine and health sciences; neuroscience; and sustainability with a particular eye toward logistics and transportation. With these themes in place, consideration can now be given to them with regard to enrollment scenarios. A couple of evaluative scenarios will be developed and will be shared with the Strategic Planning Task Force as well as through open forums for the GW community and discussions with the Faculty Senate. Actions affecting how GW enrolls students under these plans would not be enacted until the next enrollment cycle.

The Provost concluded his update by noting that a strategic planning forum will be held tomorrow in the Milken Institute School of Public Health Building at 5pm. Another is planned for March.

Professor Griesshammer (CCAS) recalled the Provost's first speech, in which he indicated he would have a data driven focus to his work and offered several comments on the data underlying the

premises of the 20/30 plan, centered on the 20% reduction in the undergraduate population the administration wishes to achieve within 5 years.

He noted that President LeBlanc has indicated that the university will realize an \$80 million revenue loss as a result of this reduction. This figure accounts for adjustments in tuition and student demographics to avoid even higher losses but not for adjustments GW will need to make in renovations, the student experience, and excellence in research and teaching, let alone STEM. The Senate's Fiscal Planning & Budgeting and Executive Vice President Diaz agree with this figure, so these data are not in dispute.

He further noted that the university community has heard that the 20% figure comes from two thick binders and hundreds of pages of data and models, but the faculty have not seen this material. What faculty have seen is a presentation of six enrollment scenarios based on the 20% figure, by then-Provost Maltzman, to the Senate Educational Policy & Technology Committee. Their methodology, data, and conclusions are not in dispute. They show that, even if a donor materialized who would close the revenue gap each year, there would still be a need to increase tuition, reduce the tuition discount rate, and reduce levels of ethnic, gender, and socioeconomic diversity. These data are not in dispute. The result of this is that, within 5 years, the face of GW becomes whiter and richer, a stereotype the university has been fighting for twenty years with quite some success until recently. Professor Griesshammer stated that the president's confidence that diversity will not go down "one iota" is not supported by the data. He questioned why, in the face of these data, the plan is proceeding.

Professor Griesshammer confirmed President LeBlanc's statement that GW has grown by 14% over the past seven years. He noted, however, that this growth allowed the university to become more diverse and inclusive, to attract more academically strong students, and to increase its retention rate. Each increase was monitored and coordinated each year with the Senate's Educational Policy committee. These data are not in dispute.

Professor Griesshammer turned to the administration's references to a number of reports on impending demographic changes that will impact undergraduate education. He noted that one report does indeed predict—over the next 10 years—a decrease in high school graduates in the Midwest of 3%. However, this report also predicts a near-flat scenario in GW's nearest region (Maryland to New York) and an increase by 7% in the South (Virginia to Texas). None of these numbers support a 20% reduction in enrollment. These data are not in dispute.

Additionally, Professor Griesshammer referenced the *Chronicle of Higher Education's* report in this area. However, this report focuses on the plight of small undergraduate institutions. It does not mention PhD-granting Research-1 universities aspiring for pre-eminence, and none in GW's market basket or above. These data are not in dispute.

Professor Griesshammer added that the DC metro area—where most of GW's students originate—will grow by 10-15% this decade. Like the rest of the country, it will also become demographically more diverse. These data are not in dispute.

Professor Griesshammer closed his remarks by stating that growing a diverse and inclusive student body appears not only morally right—as GW’s own students have noted—it is also forward-looking and fiscally responsible. He asserted that there is no evidence that the 20% cut achieves that goal. There is, however, evidence that its underlying assumptions are contradicted by reality and that its unintended consequence imperils GW’s diversity and fiscal health. He stated that, in the face of the available data, the university has not just the right but the duty to act rationally and stop the 20/30 plan.

Provost Blake responded that, in preparing for demographic changes expected in the next five years, the university can’t expect to be able to proceed under the status quo and simply draw a larger portion of then-available students. To counter this, the university can develop a prudent and systematic way of looking ahead toward smaller enrollments. It can increase investments away from the Foggy Bottom campus in order to increase revenues and offer more financial aid, and it can increase its value proposition to students. The Provost noted that applications are at the same level and quality this year that they were last year, and diversity enrollments are up this year. He noted that, while expense reductions are part of a financial strategy to manage a reduction in the size of the student body, they are not the only approach. He stated that he will be working on concrete scenarios going forward and welcomes dialogue and feedback along the way. He expressed his deep gratitude to Provost Maltzman for his leadership and noted that the scenarios he presented to Educational Policy were models on the margins and included targets GW does not intend to implement (e.g., 35% STEM). Studies since that point have involved scenarios specific to planned targets. The Provost expressed his understanding of the great concern around this area and noted that his commitment is now to put concrete plans on this path so the community can have a conversation around the plan’s next steps.

#### REPORTS BY SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS ON STRATEGIC INITIATIVES AND STRATEGIC PLANNING

1. Executive Committee/Professor Jeffrey Gutman, Acting Chair

Professor Gutman noted that his role in today’s meeting is to briefly explain the path to today’s Assembly through work done by the Senate and its committees since the October Faculty Assembly. He began by noting that, most recently, Senate Resolution 20/9, passed unanimously at the February 14 Senate meeting, states that the process of adopting and implementing the 20/30 Plan was inconsistent with principles of shared governance and requests that the administration refrain from implementing the plan until a number of things detailed in the resolution occur. This resolution and the Faculty Senate’s ongoing efforts have followed three intersecting paths:

- a. On October 28, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee directed five Senate committees to place the Assembly petition on their agendas and to respond to the petition items relative to the committees’ respective competencies; the five committees were directed to report to the Faculty Senate with a focus on how ongoing strategic planning could be improved given the Assembly petition. They have done so, and each committee will report to the Assembly shortly in this meeting.
- b. Senate Resolution 20/6 created a Special Committee charged with preparing a report on the first five items of the Assembly petition. This committee completed its report, which was posted with the agenda for this meeting, and the Special Committee chair will report to the Assembly shortly in this meeting.

- c. In September, the President commissioned a comprehensive strategic planning process. Senate Resolution 20/3, passed in November, directed the four strategic planning committees to report first to the Faculty Senate and requested the administration to provide a report on its 20/30 plan; all have done so. In addition, Senate Resolution 20/7 directed the four strategic planning committees to report their findings to the five Senate committees prior to transmitting them to the Strategic Planning Task Force and the administration.

Professor Gutman noted that the process launched by the Assembly petition in October has been implemented by the Senate, and the Senate is now in a central, deliberative position to review, comment on, and potentially amend the strategic planning reports prior to the final submission of those reports to the administration and the Board of Trustees. The Executive Committee, in particular, has sponsored resolutions to promote faculty governance on these important issues, to enhance transparency, and to create a public website to do so. In short, the Executive Committee has viewed its role in this matter as furthering the will of the Assembly through the Faculty Senate and strategic planning processes, promoting shared concepts of faculty governance and closely collaborating with the Senate (including its committees) and the strategic planning committees. All of this was done transparently and under enormous time constraints requiring a great deal of work since October. Professor Gutman thanked Executive Committee Chair Sylvia Marotta-Walters for her leadership in ushering the process through to this point, his colleagues on the Executive Committee, the chairs of the Senate committees, and President LeBlanc and Provost Blake for working collaboratively, constructively, and with good will through these important and serious issues. He also recognized the efforts of the Faculty Assembly, with whom the Senate shares support for the principles of faculty governance, transparency, diversity, responsible fiscal stewardship, and academic excellence.

2. Educational Policy & Technology/Professor Jason Zara, Chair

Professor Zara summarized the committee's responses to the points raised in the petition. On point #1, the committee echoed the sentiments in and supported Resolution 20/9. On point #2, the committee did not find the actual Culture Initiative to fall within its purview but felt the process of the initiative was important. On point #3, the committee drafted and approved Resolution 20/7 for the Senate, including one particularly important item affirming the committee's position that the strategic plan must not in any way adversely impact diversity, financial aid, the quality of the student experience, and the quality of its academics. The committee did not explicitly address point #4 and, on point #5, affirmed that coordination between the strategic planning process and the Senate is taking place and working well.

3. Research/Professor Kausik Sarkar, Chair

Professor Sarkar summarized the committee's responses to the points raised in the petition. The committee felt that points #1 & #2 did not naturally fall under the committee's purview. However, it fully supported Resolution 20/9 (point #1) and noted issues of process (point #2), supporting a faculty-led research subcommittee on the Culture Initiative to request and evaluate the initial survey and focus group questions, data findings, and implementation. Regarding point #3, the committee fully supported Resolution 20/7, emanating from the Educational Policy committee. On point #4, the committee provided feedback that there should be latitude to amend the strategic planning committee charges if

warranted as a result of the committees' work and findings. Finally, the committee discussed point #5 in detail and put forward Resolution 20/8 in support of the strategic planning committees' work with the Senate committees.

4. Fiscal Planning & Budgeting/Professor Joe Cordes, Chair

Professor Cordes summarized the committee's responses to the points raised in the petition. Regarding point #1, Professor Cordes reported that he has met regularly with Executive Vice President Diaz and will be resuming these meetings in the spring. These meetings will provide more data on the fiscal impact for the coming year, which is unfolding now as the budget is being compiled. On point #2, the committee is unable to assess costs without data from the Disney Institute. Regarding point #3, Provost Maltzman provided a detailed analysis after the October Assembly to the Educational Policy and Fiscal Planning & Budgeting committees (this report is also available on the Senate website as part of the Senate's November 2019 meeting minutes). This report includes cost numbers but also different tradeoffs around diversity and student quality; Professor Cordes noted that the cost numbers presented were broadly consistent with those from the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting committee as well as from the President; however, the \$64-70 million tuition impact does not include lost housing revenue. He noted that the first-year proposal for implementing the 20% undergraduate reduction has been cut back substantially, rendering the fiscal impact more modest. The schools are now addressing this, and the committee will have more to say on this at the March Senate meeting. The committee reviewed the strategic planning interim reports and was impressed with the good ideas put forward, noting, however, that proposed initiatives will require significant investment. Professor Cordes closed by noting that the current plan is for the coming fiscal year only and that a full five-year plan is not yet available; he hoped that Vice President Abramson will address this and noted that he is looking forward to working with him on these issues.

5. Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom/Professor Ed Swaine, Chair

Professor Swaine reported that the committee determined that some of the petition questions did not fall under the committee's jurisdiction. He reported today on the issues on which the committee provided input, summarizing them in the attached slide. Regarding Item #5, he noted that the strategic planning process and timeline has been amended since the committee's initial viewpoint was presented.

6. Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies/Professor Murli Gupta, Chair

Professor Gupta summarized the committee's responses to the points raised in the petition, referencing the attached slides, which are based on the committee's response to the Assembly petition presented to the Senate in November. The committee believes that the GW faculty needs a voice in open decision-making. In addition, the committee felt it important that the university consider the needs of students, adding undergraduate programs in data management and data skills where possible. The committee also felt it is important to ensure that faculty appointments in non-STEM areas don't decline due to an increase in the overall STEM percentage. In its work, the committee discovered that the number of faculty increased by just 15 between 2013-2018, while the number of students increased by 1284 over the same period (this data is summarized in the committee report attached to the Senate's November meeting minutes). The committee remains concerned about the fate of the doctoral programs not selected for elevation under the strategic plan.

7. Special Committee/Professor Sarah Wagner, Chair

Professor Wagner thanked all attending the Assembly today in service of shared governance and extended particular thanks to those serving on this Special Committee (Professors Joe Cordes, Guillermo Orti, Kausik Sarkar, Dan Schwartz, and Jason Zara). She reviewed the attached slides, which summarize the committee's final report (also attached), noting that the committee saw its role as fact finders on how the Senate (through its committees and as a deliberative body) and the administration responded to the petition questions. She added that the committee sent two letters to President LeBlanc as part of its fact-finding work; those letters and the President's responses are part of the committee's report. The responses by petition item are clearly laid out in the attached slides; Professor Wagner highlighted two items of note:

- a. Point #2 on the Culture Initiative led to one of the committee's letters requesting information from the President. The President's response noted that "contractual obligations require confidentiality." On the basis of that rationale, no information was provided on either the costs of the initiative or the survey methods or analysis used during the initiative.
- b. Regarding point #3, the committee felt there were questions that went unanswered by the President during his December presentation to the Senate. The committee sent eight discrete follow-up questions to the President. Answering the first three questions, the President provided specific names of those serving on the strategic enrollment committee as well as the individuals who gave presentations to that committee as well as to the Board of Trustees at their retreat. Other questions and associated requests remained unanswered. The committee asked whether Provost Maltzman's enrollment models recommended cutting the undergraduate enrollment by 20%; for specific data regarding the comparative analyses of GW with both aspirational and peer private universities as referenced in the President's December Senate report; for reports, remarks, and copies of presentations made to the strategic enrollment committee; for specific models or data on GW enrollment projections provided in the President's December Senate report, given that the sources cover national trends rather than GW's particular region and R1 universities. The committee did not receive these data. Professor Wagner quoted President LeBlanc's response to these requests in his two-page February 4 response to the committee: "there was no specific report, consultant, singular data point, or recommendation that led the Board, with my concurrence, to the decision to reduce the undergraduate residential headcount and increase the fraction of STEM majors."

At its February meeting, the Senate unanimously approved placing the report on the Special Assembly agenda.

REVIEW OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE FACULTY SENATE DURING THE 2019-2020 ACADEMIC YEAR REGARDING STRATEGIC INITIATIVES AND STRATEGIC PLANNING (Senate Executive Committee Resolution of October 28, 2019 and Senate Resolutions 20/3, 20/5, 20/6, 20/7, 20/8, and 20/9).

Professor Marotta-Walters noted that the Assembly now has the opportunity to engage in a robust discussion on what has transpired in today's meeting; this will be done in the form of a motion.

Professor Griesshammer moved that the Assembly support *en bloc* the resolutions and reports by the Faculty Senate and its committees, thereby sending a clear signal to the administration and the Board

of Trustees. These resolutions and reports represent the opinion of a small group of activists—namely, the approximately forty senators who unanimously voted for Resolution 20/9. He noted his gratitude to the Senate and all its committees for the hard, tedious, and thankless work, which Professor Wagner has just eloquently summarized. Now, he continued, is the time to substitute data for anecdotes and to draw conclusions based on these data—or on the absence of data—which by now is a datum in itself. He added that over 100 faculty signed a supporting petition which will be considered by the Senate Executive Committee this week.

He noted his conclusions that the rollout of the 20/30 plan violated shared governance; that the ongoing unilateral planning and implementation of the plan continues to violate shared governance; that there is no logical rationale for the 20% undergraduate reduction; and that the plan will adversely affect student diversity and inclusion as well as GW's long-term fiscal health. As GW is its people, the 20/30 plan impacts everyone at the university. Today's vote will affirm the Assembly's commitment to GW's future health.

Professor Marotta-Walters recalled that there was a motion (as seconded) that the Resolutions of the Senate be approved *en bloc* and opened the floor for debate on the motion.

Professor Orti spoke in favor of the motion, commenting specifically on the Assembly petition point #2 regarding the Culture Initiative. As reported at this meeting, the Senate was not provided with the data necessary to evaluate the funds spent on the Culture Initiative. Professor Orti quoted from the President's response to the Special Committee's request for data on the initiative, "The initiative also has driven many significant decisions that have improved living, learning, and working on our campuses for all students, faculty, and staff, including implementing the new winter break schedule." Professor Orti noted that, according to the *GW Hatchet*, the winter break schedule was announced in January 2018, well before the Culture Initiative was launched in April. Further, the president wrote, "the Institutional Culture Initiative is about GW and not an external organization. The work and accomplishments, to date, have all been initiated, produced and prepared, and driven by GW and our community." Professor Orti expressed that, based on the few facts in hand, this is hard to believe, noting that, in his opinion, "this top-down initiative designed by the Disney Institute is the opposite of what this university needs." In other words, Professor Orti noted that the administration signed a secret contract, so the cost cannot be made public; information about the survey design and validity have not been provided; and the Senate could not evaluate the return on investment for this initiative. Professor Orti noted that the faculty are left with an official story that includes a diligent definition of common purpose and values; he noted it seems ironic that "openness" is one of those values. He noted that the narrative created by the Culture Leadership Team can be read in *GW Today*, *GW InfoMails*, and sometimes in the *GW Hatchet*.

Professor Orti noted that half of the human resources staff visited Disney as part of the initiative and that that university's leadership team frequently takes expensive trips to Orlando to gain firsthand insight into Disney's "magic world" culture, to be trained in corporate methods, and to pledge allegiance to the Disneyfication of GW (referencing a colleague quoted in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "to create a more disciplined and compliant work force"). As an academic, Professor Orti noted that it has been a demeaning experience to be part of a university that imposes such principles on its faculty, and asks everyone to just be "happy ever after."

He noted that, ultimately, the university may ask whether the workshops are working and is the campus embracing Our GW values. To answer these questions, he wondered if the Disney Institute

would need to be called upon to conduct another well-compensated assessment. He suggested that, no, Gallup would be hired instead, but the faculty would never see the data from such an assessment. In conclusion, he noted that the only substantial report on this topic from the Senate that was offered to this Assembly was prepared by the Senate Research Committee (referencing Table 2 in the attached Special Committee report). This committee supports convening a faculty-led research subcommittee on the Culture Initiative to evaluate the questions, data, and implementation of the Culture Initiative. Professor Orti strongly endorsed this recommendation and offered his vote to affirm their action.

Professor Wood noted that, following his comments at the October Assembly, he was told by an individual that his comments about President LeBlanc were disrespectful. He suggested that President LeBlanc is the one who has been disrespectful, both in the lack of information provided to faculty and in the lack of faculty involvement in decision-making. He noted that he speaks as a University Professor because he believes he can do so without repercussion; the fact that others do not speak out due to their sense that they cannot safely express their opinions is a reflection on the university led by President LeBlanc.

Professor Wood noted the President has now been here for over two years and offered an evaluation of his performance, much as Professor Wood's students offer evaluations of their experiences in his courses. He expressed his lack of support of the Disney Institute and the Culture Initiative, noting that Disney, as a company, has a function to provide entertainment and to take people out of the real world. He noted that his job as a university teacher is to make sure that the students he teaches and influences understand that there is a reality and that they must operate in that reality. The notion, therefore, that anyone would use an organization whose reason for existence is to escape reality seems beyond comprehension.

However, he noted, he attended and participated in the Culture Initiative class and came away with a card summarizing the Our GW values. He offered the values on this card as the basis for a report card of the President's performance at GW to date. In reviewing the values one by one, Professor Wood made several comments. He noted that he did not think it was an honest and fair response to the inquiry about the Disney Institute's involvement at GW to say that, effectively, they have no involvement any longer; this does not ring true when trips to the Institute continue by leadership and human resources staff. He indicated that faculty are willing to collaborate and do so all the time without a need to be instructed to do so; he referenced large interdisciplinary research grants as an example. Regarding courage, Professor Wood highlighted the ability to learn from failure, noting that, as physicians do, university presidents should adhere to the Hippocratic Oath. He wondered if President LeBlanc could honestly attest to having done no harm in his time at GW. Noting that he has already addressed respect, he turned to excellence, noting that it may have been creative but it was not wise to engage the Disney Institute at GW. On diversity, Professor Wood noted that the incoming class's increase in diversity is a positive development, as recent publicity may not help further develop diversity at GW. He noted that everyone makes mistakes but expressed his belief that, in a conversation about academic freedom, it would be "probably years" before he might have come up with the example President LeBlanc used regarding African American students. He further noted that he has perceived that President LeBlanc operates under an assumption that students of color at GW are first generation college students, applying a stereotype to that group. He noted in a sidebar comment that these remarks are also directed to the Board of Trustees and that he hopes they will listen as well. Regarding openness, Professor Wood noted that, when information and data have been requested, it has not been provided. In summary, Professor Wood suggested that the

President needs to work out the culture of the school and needs to understand that the culture of GW is not the same as the University of Miami. The evidence would indicate that the President would like to impose a culture; before doing so, Professor Wood suggested that the President determine what the existing culture is, if indeed universities have a “culture.”

In closing, Professor Wood strongly recommended that the President listen more and say less. He noted the large group assembled today came to this meeting to send the President a message. He added that his self-appointed task in his comments is to be their voice. He asked the President to observe the assembled group and understand they are here to work hard and it is they who have made GW what it is. Finally, Professor Wood noted that the faculty did not come to the Assembly “to praise Caesar.”

Professor Yezer echoed the concerns of many about the fiscal implications of the 20/30 plan on GW. He noted that GW owes almost \$2 billion and is obligated to its debt holders. The university is evaluated by S&P and Moody’s and is constrained in its options by this. While the enrollment task force can talk about aspirational concepts, it is constrained by the reality of its finances.

Professor Perry requested clarification of the motion. Professor Marotta-Walters responded that the motion is to approve *en bloc* the actions of the Senate in response to the Strategic Initiatives, Strategic Planning, and the October Assembly petition:

Professor Griesshammer requested a teller vote for the record. The motion was approved unanimously (189 in favor, none opposed).

The meeting was adjourned at 5:28pm.



## Faculty Senate

### A RESOLUTION BY THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ON SHARED GOVERNANCE IN UNIVERSITY DECISION-MAKING AND STRATEGIC PLANNING

**WHEREAS**, the *Faculty Code* states that the regular faculty shares with the officers of administration the responsibility for effective operation of the departments and schools and the university as a whole;

**WHEREAS**, the *Faculty Code* states that in the exercise of this responsibility, the regular faculty also participates in the formulation of policy and planning decisions affecting the quality of education and life at the university;

**WHEREAS**, the *Faculty Code* states that Faculty bodies charged with responsibilities for particular policy and planning areas are entitled, to the extent feasible, to be informed sufficiently in advance of important decisions within their areas of competence to be able to provide their advice or recommendations to the appropriate university officials;

**WHEREAS**, the *Faculty Organization Plan* designates the Faculty Senate as the entity to which the President initially presents information, and which is consulted concerning proposed changes in existing policies or promulgation of new policies;

**WHEREAS**, on September 12, 2019, President Thomas LeBlanc presented the framework for the new strategic planning process to the university community and announced the formation of four committees to guide the strategic planning process (World Class Faculty, High-Quality Undergraduate Education, Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education, and High-Impact Research);

**WHEREAS**, at the Senate meeting on October 11, 2019, the Chair of the University Board of Trustees, Ms. Grace E. Speights, stated that she wanted to see the Senate fully engaged in the strategic planning process and that a draft of the new Strategic Plan would be brought to the Senate before it goes to the Board for approval;

**WHEREAS**, the *Faculty Organization Plan* states that the Faculty Assembly has the power to instruct the Senate to take action with respect to any matter of concern to the Assembly;

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Assembly comprises both regular and special faculty and listed University officials;

**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 five items relating to ongoing university initiatives<sup>1</sup> and strategic planning (see Petition attached as Appendix A);

**WHEREAS**, the Petition refers to these four Senate Committees: Educational Policy & Technology; Fiscal Planning & Budgeting; Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom; and Research;

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) is given the responsibility to "Assist in carrying into effect the actions of the Assembly..." and to "Act on behalf of the Senate in emergencies on matters requiring immediate action..."; and

**WHEREAS**, the FSEC considers that a fifth committee, Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policy Committee (ASPP), should address the issues listed in the Petition.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

- 1) That the four committees listed in the Petition plus the ASPP Committee should place the Petition on their respective agendas beginning with their next meeting, and review points in the Petition to prioritize those that are relevant to their respective competencies, with a focus on improving strategic planning at the University going forward;
- 2) That the five Senate committees should provide the Senate with a preliminary report on their findings in response to the Petition before the Senate meeting on November 8, 2019, if possible, and no later than the Senate meeting on December 13, 2019;
- 3) That the Chair of the Executive Committee should provide a copy of the Petition passed by the Assembly to the Chair of the Board of Trustees;
- 4) That the Chair of the Executive Committee should invite the chairs and co-chairs of the four Planning Committees to provide a preliminary report to the Senate at the next Senate meeting on November 8, 2019;
- 5) That the Chair of the Executive Committee should not automatically call a Special Meeting of the Assembly between January 13 and January 24, 2020, recognizing that the Faculty Organization Plan provides a petitioning process for Assembly members to call a Special Meeting of the Assembly; and
- 6) That the Senate Operations Coordinator should seek to reserve the State Room for additional Regular or Special meetings of the Senate in early 2020.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
October 28, 2019

Appendix A: A Petition to the Assembly

---

<sup>1</sup>Besides strategic planning, the ongoing university initiatives addressed in the Petition include the increase in the percent of STEM majors, the decrease in undergraduate enrollment, and the initiative for improving GWU's culture.

## Appendix A

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](mailto:gorti@gwu.edu)
2. Jamie Cohen-Cole, Dept. of American Studies. [jcohencole@gwu.edu](mailto:jcohencole@gwu.edu)
3. Bernard Wood, Dept. of Anthropology. [bernardawood@gmail.com](mailto:bernardawood@gmail.com)
4. Sarah Wagner, Dept. of Anthropology. [sewagner@email.gwu.edu](mailto:sewagner@email.gwu.edu)
5. Ivy Ken, Dept. of Sociology, [ivyleighken@gmail.com](mailto:ivyleighken@gmail.com)
6. Harald Griesshammer, Dept. of Physics. [hgrie@gwu.edu](mailto:hgrie@gwu.edu)

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

**Senate Resolution 20/3**  
**(attachments included previously in this document)**



**A RESOLUTION ON STRENGTHENING THE FACULTY ROLE IN STRATEGIC  
PLANNING (20/3)**

**WHEREAS**, the *Faculty Code* (Article IX.A) states that "The regular faculty shares with the officers of administration the responsibility for effective operation of the departments and schools and the university as a whole";

**WHEREAS**, the *Faculty Code* (Article IX.A) states that in the exercise of this responsibility, the regular faculty "also participates in the formulation of policy and planning decisions affecting the quality of education and life at the university";

**WHEREAS**, the *Faculty Code* (Article IX.B) states that "Faculty bodies charged with responsibilities for particular policy and planning areas are entitled, to the extent feasible, to be informed sufficiently in advance of important decisions within their areas of competence to be able to provide their advice or recommendations to the appropriate university officials";

**WHEREAS**, the *Faculty Organization Plan* (Article III, §1(4)) designates the Faculty Senate as the "Faculty agency to which the President initially presents information, and which he consults concerning proposed changes in existing policies or promulgation of new policies";

**WHEREAS**, on September 12, 2019, President Thomas LeBlanc presented the framework for the new strategic planning process which includes four committees (World Class Faculty, High-Quality Undergraduate Education, Distinguished and Distinctive Graduate Education, and High-Impact Research) and a Strategic Planning Task Force to coordinate the work of the four committees;

**WHEREAS**, at the Senate meeting on October 11, 2019, the Chair of the University Board of Trustees, Ms. Grace E. Speights, stated that she wanted to see the Senate fully engaged in the strategic planning process and that a draft of the new Strategic Plan would be brought to the Senate before it goes to the Board for approval;

**WHEREAS**, At the Senate meeting on October 11, 2019, President LeBlanc supported the Chair's statement about Senate involvement, and added that the four strategic planning committees could report to the Senate on the progress of their charges;

**WHEREAS**, the *Faculty Organization Plan* states that the Faculty Assembly has the power to instruct the Senate to take action with respect to any matter of concern to the Assembly;

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Assembly comprises both regular and special faculty and listed University officials;

**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 five items relating to ongoing university initiatives<sup>1</sup> and strategic planning (see Attachment 1 below);

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) is given the responsibility to "Assist in carrying into effect the actions of the Assembly..." and to "Act on behalf of the Senate in emergencies on matters requiring immediate action...";

**WHEREAS**, at its regular meeting on October 25, 2019, the FSEC discussed the follow-up from the Assembly and approved an FSEC Resolution finalized and announced on October 28, 2019 (see below);

**WHEREAS**, Chair Speights has announced an "ambitious" and rapid timetable for strategic planning that would have the Strategic Planning Task Force propose recommendations to the Board at its February 7, 2020, meeting (in order to inform the 2021 budget process) and recommend for approval the finalized strategic plan in advance of the Board's meeting on May 15, 2020; and

**WHEREAS**, a new Provost has just begun his service to the University and enabling his input into strategic planning is essential to its success;

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

- 1) The Faculty Senate finds that in order to provide a minimally adequate time for faculty consideration of the Reports of four strategic planning Committees, the first draft of these Reports should be provided to the Senate by January 3 so that a discussion of these Reports (and the Task Force draft Report if available) can be included on the agenda of the Senate's meeting on January 10, 2020;
- 2) That the Faculty Senate urges the Senate Committees, as appropriate, and the four Strategic Planning Committees, to engage in ongoing reciprocal communications;
- 3) That the Faculty-Senate Executive Committee seek close cooperation with the Strategic Task Force in order to meet the Board's ambitious schedule or, if that schedule proves too ambitious, to devise jointly a modified schedule to allow for systematic and substantive faculty involvement in all of the key issues being examined in strategic planning; and

---

<sup>1</sup>Besides strategic planning, the ongoing university initiatives addressed in the Petition include the increase in the percent of STEM majors, the decrease in undergraduate enrollment, and the initiative for improving GWU's culture.

- 4) That the Administration is requested to prepare a detailed report (including data on enrollment composition and fiscal implications) on its initiatives to reduce the undergraduate population and to increase STEM majors for presentation to the Senate at its December 13, 2019, meeting, and that such report should address the rationale for any quantitative goals and a plan for managing the impact of these initiatives on academic resources and student diversity.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
November 8, 2019

Approved as amended by the Faculty Senate  
November 8, 2019

Attachment 1: Faculty Senate Executive Committee Resolution and Appendix A (Assembly Petition)

**Senate Resolution 20/5**



**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 in view of the change in the calendar for the strategic plan, the Senate requests the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to call a Special Meeting of the Faculty Assembly in February 2020.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate  
November 22, 2019

Adopted as amended by the Faculty Senate  
December 13, 2019

**Senate Resolution 20/6**



**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 February 3, 2020, and shall be placed on the Agenda of the February 14, 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 February 14, 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

Adopted as amended by the Faculty Senate  
December 13, 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 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;<sup>1</sup> **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

---

<sup>1</sup> **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>

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?
  - 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 Faculty Senate 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 6, 2019

Adopted as amended by the Faculty Senate  
December 13, 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;<sup>1</sup> **NOW, THEREFORE**

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.”

**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; 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, (d) Research, and e) Appointment, Salary, & Promotion Policies 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 1, 2019

Adopted as amended by the Faculty Senate  
December 13, 2019

---

“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>



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**WHEREAS**, President LeBlanc announced on July 9, 2019, a plan to reduce undergraduate enrollment by 20% and to change the relative proportions of the student majors and therefore to alter the curricular program of the university<sup>2</sup> without having previously consulted in sufficient detail

---

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

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

with the relevant Senate committees and the Senate as a whole and proceeded to implement the plans with the enrollment of the 2019/2020 class;

**WHEREAS**, President LeBlanc stated repeatedly that changes to the undergraduate student body will not cause diversity to go down “one iota”<sup>3</sup> and the chair of the Board of Trustees reaffirmed that diversity will not be impacted as a result of this plan<sup>4</sup>, while the Senate and its Committees have not yet received or been given the opportunity to evaluate any compelling evidence that these current diversity and academic quality standards can be maintained while simultaneously reducing the size of its student body and increasing STEM majors; **NOW, THEREFORE**,

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

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

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

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

Amendments to the Resolving Clauses Adopted by the Faculty Senate  
January 10, 2020

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

Adopted by the Faculty Senate  
February 14, 2020

---

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

<sup>4</sup> Faculty Senate Minutes for October 11, 2019 Regular meeting

# Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) Committee: Responses to Assembly Petition

- Item 1. Committee members expressed concern regarding whether shared governance had been respected, and indicated that this remains a matter of interest to the committee.
- Item 4.4. The committee expressed support for encouraging team-based and multidisciplinary work, while also reaffirming academic freedom as reflected in the Faculty Code.
- Item 5. The committee supported proposals that the strategic planning committees report to the faculty, as one means of facilitating shared governance.

Committee on Appointment, Salary,  
and Promotion Policies  
Petition Responses

Presented by Prof. Murli M. Gupta, ASPP Chair

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

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

*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 Response: We have no knowledge.**

*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?*

ASPP Response: We have no idea.

*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?*

ASPP Response: This information is probably available somewhere but we don't know.

*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?*

**ASPP Response: This needs to be determined. The ASPP committee supports the mission of the university.**

*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 Response: The premise is unclear. What stops team-based research?

*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 Response: Yes. The timeline for the strategic planning committees has been modified to allow for faculty input.**

# REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON MATTERS INCLUDED IN THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY PETITION

---

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY SENATE ON FEBRUARY 14, 2020

---

# OCTOBER 22, 2019 FACULTY ASSEMBLY PETITION

**Item #1:** whether the strategic plan followed principles of shared governance

**Item #2:** the costs and methodology of the Cultural Initiative

**Item #3:** on the data supporting the 20/30 plan

**Item #4:** on amending the charges of the strategic planning committees

**Item #5:** on the strategic planning timeline and consultation with faculty

**Item #6:** charge to convene a Special Assembly

---

## DATA COMPILED

- ▶ Responses of the five Faculty Senate Committees (Appointments, Salaries and Promotion Policies; Research; Education and Technology Policy; Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom; and Fiscal Planning and Budgeting)
- ▶ Senate resolutions and reports (ASPP Report to the Senate; Resolution 20/7 from EP&T; Resolution 20/8 from Research Committee; Resolution 20/9 on Shared Governance)
- ▶ President LeBlanc's December 13, 2019 report to the Senate and his responses to two letters from the Special Committee regarding petition items #2 and 3

---

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

### **Item #1 (on shared governance):**

Several committees determined that the strategic plan did not properly follow the principles of shared governance.

The Senate concurred with this assessment, voting unanimously to approve the revised Resolution 20/9 on February 14, 2020.

---

## **Item #2 (on the costs and methodology of the Cultural Initiative):**

No specific data regarding the cost of the initiative, the Disney Institute consultation, or the cultural survey design and analysis were provided to the Special Committee, the Senate, or the petitioning Faculty as a whole.

---

### **Item #3 (on data supporting the 20/30 plan):**

The Senate and its five committees received fragmentary and incomplete information that does not logically support the 20/30 plan.

Several attempts to collect specific data (e.g. Resolution 20/7, item #3, questions a. through h. and the Special Committee's January 17, 2020 letter to President LeBlanc) did not produce the specific information requested.

---

## **Item #4 (on amending the charges of the strategic planning committees):**

The Research Committee supported changing the charges of the strategic planning committees.

Other committees provided comments regarding ideal STEM ratios, student body size, undergraduate enrollment, and team-based research.

President LeBlanc did not provide specific data regarding impact of the 20/30 plan on the curricular, research, and diversity and inclusion missions of the University.

The Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee indicated that it intends to address the financial implications of enrollment reductions in time for the February 25, 2020 Special Assembly.

---

## **Item #5 (on the strategic planning timeline and consultation with faculty):**

The Senate and its five committees requested that they have the opportunity to review and respond to the strategic planning documents before submission to President LeBlanc and the Board of Trustees.

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

---

## **Item #6 (Special Assembly):**

The Special Assembly was scheduled for February 25, 2020, one month later than the date requested in the petition.

The Senate set this date so that the Assembly could respond to the strategic planning reports.

---

## CONCLUSIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **I. THE SENATE COMMITTEES' RESPONSES:**

### **Appointments, Salaries and Promotion Policies Committee**

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

### **Research Committee**

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

### **Education Policy and Technology Committee**

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

### **Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom**

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

### **Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee**

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

## **II. SHARED GOVERNANCE**

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

## **III. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SOUGHT FROM PRESIDENT LEBLANC**

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

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

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

## **IV. CONCLUSION**

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

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

**Resolutions 20/7, 20/8, and 20/9 are included earlier in this document**

**APPENDIX: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**ASPP Committee Response: We have no knowledge.**

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

**ASPP Committee Responses:**

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

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

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

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

Respectfully Submitted

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

---

## Enrollments and Faculty Size (2012-2019)

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

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

January 17, 2020

Dear President LeBlanc,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your time and attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

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

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

January 27, 2020

Dear President LeBlanc,

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your time and attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wagner  
Daniel Schwartz  
Joseph Cordes

Guillermo Orti  
Jason Zara  
Kausik Sarkar

February 5, 2020

Special Committee of the Faculty Senate:

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

Dear Colleagues:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

Thomas J. LeBlanc

January 31, 2020

Special Committee of the Faculty Senate:

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

Dear Colleagues:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

Thomas J. LeBlanc