

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.**

**REGULAR FACULTY ASSEMBLY  
September 29, 2003  
Marvin Center, Continental Ballroom**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**The Assembly was called to order by President Trachtenberg at 3:05 p.m.**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**The minutes of the regular Assembly of November 11, 2002, were approved as distributed.**

**CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

**Professor Robinson moved to change the order of the Assembly's agenda so that the Bender Teaching Awards could be heard as the next item of business. The motion was seconded, and passed.**

**PRESENTATION OF THE BENDER TEACHING AWARDS**

**Before announcing the awards, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman noted that Mr. Morton Bender was present at the Assembly, and he thanked him for making the awards possible.**

**The following faculty members each received a Bender Teaching Award in the underlined categories. The text of the faculty citations also appears below.**

**Part-time faculty**

**Mark Allenbaugh – Philosophy**

**Mark Allenbaugh has been a part-time Lecturer at GW since 1998 while also pursuing his career as an attorney. In Philosophy of Law and in Ethics for Business and the Professions in particular, Professor Allenbaugh brings his experiences in government and in private practice into the classroom. Faculty peers have noted that Professor Allenbaugh succeeds in demonstrating the relevance of philosophical, and especially ethical, reflections to the real-time and real-work careers students will pursue beyond college. Professor Allenbaugh is also a challenging teacher; he expects much of his students in terms of what they will prepare and how they will comport themselves during class. His department chair and students alike note that students who receive an A in his courses never doubt that they have earned that grade.**

**Innovative Use of Technology****Ranjan Chhibber – University Honors Program**

Ranjan Chhibber has been at GW since 2001 and is now Assistant Professor of Film Studies and Honors with the University Honors Program. Professor Chhibber's inspiring and eye-opening approach to teaching is credited as much of the reason that Film Studies boasts 20 minors after one year in existence. Students flock to his courses for a new, more conscious and more intense perception of film. Professor Chhibber has helped to build the Gelman DVD collection and has worked hard to promote Film Studies at GW. It is, however, his teaching that stands out, first and foremost, among his accomplishments. Technologically savvy, creative, and always accessible to students, he has made Film Studies a genuine presence at GW.

**General****Cayo Gamber – University Writing**

As of this academic year, Cayo Gamber is one of fourteen faculty members engaged in the teaching of writing in the new University Writing Program. Prior to this appointment, Professor Gamber was a faculty member in the English department, also teaching courses in Women's Studies. Among the many accolades in Professor Gamber's nomination packet, one example stands out as a clear indication of how deserved this award is. In Professor Gamber's first-year course on research methods, she insists that the students collect exhaustive bibliographies (up to fifty texts), analyze their sources in depth, and synthesize all their findings into an extensive analytical paper. When the semester is done, the students turn in portfolios that are over a hundred pages long and include their reflections on the research materials they have studied, thus explicitly tracing out a research project that culminates in up to twenty pages of original research.

**Innovative Use of Technology****Steve McGraw – Clinical Management & Leadership**

Steve McGraw is a pioneer in the use of distance education technologies in higher education. Beginning in 1997 with scant resources, Professor McGraw and his colleague, Cathy Turley, conceptualized, designed, and implemented the Clinical Management and Leadership program in Health Sciences at GW. Since then, this program has expanded to include graduate concentrations in several areas and worldwide student enrollment. Professor McGraw's grasp of technological tools as a medium for delivering information and his commitment to keeping up with new and emerging technologies and their classroom applications are second only to his overarching dedication to enhancing student learning. Despite the unique challenges of distance education – separation of time and space, in particular – Professor McGraw keeps students engaged and excited about learning, using online weekly quizzes, peer evaluation and critique, and stimulating discussion questions. As one student put it, "At graduation...I met Steve McGraw in person for the very first time, but I felt like I had known him forever."

**Full-time, nontenured****Andrew Zimmerman – History**

Andrew Zimmerman teaches courses populated in large part by students who are there to meet some requirement, either undergraduate or graduate. One such course is the modern half of the European history survey, which not only satisfies various requirements but is also quite large. This could be a recipe for student dissatisfaction, but, in this and all of Professor Zimmerman's courses, the course evaluations are highly positive; none is negative. Students praise his enthusiasm and dynamism, his knowledge, how well organized he is, how well he encourages questions and discussions, and his accessibility to students. Senior faculty members noted many of the same qualities the students praised when they observed his classes. One quotation from student evaluations reflects the prevailing opinions of his teaching abilities: "I took this class to fulfill a requirement, so initially I wasn't excited about this course. However, due to (Professor) Zimmerman's enthusiasm and lecture style...I caught myself looking forward to coming to class. I would recommend (Professor) Zimmerman and this class to anyone – and have!"

**General****Martín Zysmilich – Chemistry**

Martín Zysmilich has been with the Department of Chemistry at GW for four years, and his outstanding teaching has already been recognized through his receipt of the Kenny Prize for Innovative Teaching Methods in an Introductory Course, awarded by the Columbian College of Arts & Sciences. Professor Zysmilich has demonstrated an excellent teaching style and extraordinary sense of humor in the classroom, but another factor that has helped maintain student interest is his use of available technologies. Lecture materials are downloadable and include audio and video clips as well as web-based materials and other graphical format items. The result is extraordinary, capturing the interest of the students, enhancing the lectures, and leading to improvements in student engagement. Professor Zysmilich has moved the teaching bar higher with challenging material and higher expectations of each student.

**RESOLUTIONS****RESOLUTION FA 03/1 "A RESOLUTION ON CHANGES TO THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN"**

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Lilien Robinson, Chair, made a motion to amend in the form of a substitution for Resolution 03/1, as originally distributed with the Assembly agenda. Following distribution of the substitute Resolution, Professor Robinson asked for a vote on acceptance of the substitute Resolution, which was unanimously approved without discussion.

Professor Robinson then moved the adoption of substitute Resolution 03/1 and briefly summarized the Resolution's provisions for the Assembly. There being no

discussion of the Resolution, a vote was taken, and the Resolution was adopted by unanimous vote.

### INTRODUCTION OF NEW FACULTY

Vice President Lehman welcomed faculty new to the University, and he called upon those present to introduce themselves to the Assembly. He asked that they describe their appointment, indicate the school in which they held appointment, and say a few words about their interests in scholarship, research, and/or teaching at the University.

The following new faculty were introduced:

#### Columbian College of Arts and Sciences

Alexandre M. Baptista, Finance  
Anna Adams, Management Science  
Homayoun Khamooshi, Management Science  
Gelaye Debebe, Administrative Science  
Tracy Dumas, Administrative Science  
Shannon McPherron, Anthropology  
Zhengtao Xu, Chemistry  
Abby Wilkerson, English  
Yuriko Yamaguchi, Fine Arts and Art History  
David Silverman, History  
Inhyeop Yi, Mathematics  
Tonya Dodge, Psychology  
Sergio Waisman, Romance Languages and Literature  
Shelley B. Brundage, Speech and Hearing  
Ryan Claycomb, University Writing Program  
Cayo Gamber, University Writing Program  
Robbin Zeff, University Writing Program

#### School of Engineering and Applied Science

Erik Larsson, Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Enrique Campos-Nanez, Engineering Management and Systems Engineering

#### Graduate School of Education and Human Development

Monica Megivern, Counseling and Human Studies  
Rebecca Dedmond, Counseling and Human Studies

#### GW Law School

Thomas Colby  
James Ziglar

#### School of Public Health and Health Services

Ruth Katz, Dean and Health Policy  
Mark Edberg, Prevention and Community Health

**School of Medicine and Health Sciences**

**Marcos Rojkind, Pathology**

The introductions were followed by a round of applause from the Assembly, and President Trachtenberg added his own personal welcome to this outstanding group of new faculty.

**REMARKS BY THE CHAIR OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Professor Robinson added words of welcome to the new faculty, and also congratulated the recipients of the Bender Teaching Awards. On behalf of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, Professor Robinson then presented her report to the Assembly. (Report by Professor Robinson is enclosed and made a part of these minutes.)

**REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

President Trachtenberg addressed the Assembly by delivering a speech entitled "The Worldly University." (Remarks by the President are attached and made a part of these minutes.)

**REMARKS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

Vice President Lehman presented remarks entitled "Highlights of Strategic Academic Initiatives." (Remarks by the Vice President are attached and made a part of these minutes.)

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Assembly, and upon motion made and seconded, President Trachtenberg adjourned the meeting at 4:30 P.M. after inviting everyone present to the reception immediately following.

Dennis L. Geyer  
Dennis L. Geyer  
Registrar

**MOTION TO AMEND IN THE FORM OF A SUBSTITUTION FOR Resolution FA 03/1,  
as originally distributed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate**

**A RESOLUTION ON CHANGES TO THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN (FA 03/1)**

**WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan, published in 1987, provides for representation on the Faculty Senate from: Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Education and Human Development, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of Government and Business Administration, the National Law Center, the School of International Affairs, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Medicine and Health Sciences; and**

**WHEREAS, the names of four Schools have been changed, one School has been eliminated, and one School has been established; and**

**~~WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan should accurately identify the academic units as they now exist; and~~**

**WHEREAS, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences has been merged into the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences; and**

**WHEREAS, the School of Public Health and Health Services was established subsequent to the 1987 publication of the Faculty Organization Plan and therefore is not listed or assigned representation, ~~as are all other Schools,~~ on the Faculty Senate; NOW, THEREFORE**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:**

- 1. That ~~all of the following~~ Schools which ~~comprise the academic units of the University~~ be accurately listed in Article III, Section 2 of the Faculty Organization Plan as follows: Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the Law School, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, the School of Business and Public Management, the Elliott School of International Affairs, and the School of Public Health and Health Services.**
- 2. That references to the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences be deleted.**
- 3. That the School of Public Health and Health Services be listed as one of the Schools of the University and allotted, ~~as are all other Schools,~~ representation on the Faculty Senate and on the Executive Committee.**
- 4. That the School of Public Health and Health Services be allotted one elected member on the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee.**

**Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate as directed by Faculty Senate Resolution 02/4  
adopted November 8, 2002  
September 15, 2003**

**Adopted September 29, 2003 by the Faculty Assembly**

**REPORT TO THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY**  
**Lilien F. Robinson, Chair**  
**Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate**  
**September 29, 2003**

On behalf of your colleagues on the Faculty Senate, I would like to report on matters which have been and are currently before the Senate.

**RESOLUTIONS**

Four resolutions were considered by the Faculty Senate since the November 11, 2002 Faculty Assembly. These resolutions are reflective of the work of the Faculty Senate, as they address internally and externally initiated issues of importance to our faculty. It should be stressed that the Senate is both responsive and proactive with respect to matters of concern across school lines. It is the primary vehicle of faculty communication with the officers of the administration and the Board of Trustees. The work of the standing committees, reports and resolutions, reflective of the priorities and concerns of the faculty, are transmitted, through a variety of mechanisms, to the administration and to the Board of Trustees and/or its committees.

I would like to briefly comment on three of the resolutions.

**1. A Resolution on Changes to the Faculty Organization Plan**

Presented by the Executive Committee, the resolution provides for insertion of corrected school designations and inclusion of the School of Public Health and Health Services in the Faculty Organization Plan. It also provides for that school's Senate and Executive Committee representation. As indicated with the agenda for today's meeting this resolution requires approval of the Faculty Assembly.

**2. A Resolution on Establishment of a School of Public Policy and Public Administration within the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences**

The proposal for the new school, which combines existing programs in the School of Business and Public Management and Columbian College, was presented by a joint subcommittee. The cross-disciplinary nature of the curriculum and research, the administrative simplification which would be achieved, and the potential for a competitive advantage over other institutions drew approval of the resolution.

**3. A Resolution on the Alternative Academic Calendar**

Presented by the Executive Committee, this resolution was prompted by concerns that pursuant to its Faculty Code mandated role, the Faculty Senate have time to consider the report of the special administration committee on the academic calendar, which has developed possible sweeping changes in the academic program and the award of academic credit. Accordingly, the resolution requests that no action on an alternative academic calendar be

taken until the Faculty Senate has had an opportunity to consider the report of the special administration committee as well as available data and provide its recommendations on the alternative academic calendar.

At the time of the resolution's presentation at the May meeting, President Trachtenberg indicated that the Administration would accept the resolution, provided the Senate would agree to meeting a deadline by which he hoped it would respond to the report of the administration's committee on the Alternative Calendar. When the report of the special committee was transmitted to the faculty during the summer the President set November 1<sup>st</sup> as the deadline for faculty response.

The Senate's Educational Policy Committee is in the process of reviewing that report. It will be presenting a resolution to the Faculty Senate on October 31<sup>st</sup>. The regular Senate meeting was rescheduled in order to provide time for the Educational Policy Committee to produce a report and a resolution. Because of the enormous impact that the proposals contained in the report of the special administration committee, if implemented, would have on almost all aspects of instruction, including the role of the faculty, the Educational Policy Committee would appreciate receiving your comments on the report as soon as possible. These may be e-mailed to Professor Paul Duff, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (duff@gwu.edu), your Senate representative(s), or to the Faculty Senate Office (lsbc@gwu.edu). Senate representatives are also reporting and initiating discussions at their school meetings on this matter. Please review the report of the special committee. In the event that you do not have the full report with appendices, please contact the Senate office.

## **STATUS OF FACULTY PERSONNEL MATTERS**

### **Grievances**

There are presently two grievances in process, both originating in Columbian College. One is in the mediation stage. With the appointment of a hearing panel, the other case has entered the hearing stage.

### **Nonconcurrences**

Two nonconcurrences in the Columbian College were received by the Executive Committee. One, an administrative nonconcurrency with respect to promotion, has been accepted by the department. The second case, a nonconcurrency with a faculty tenure and promotion recommendation, has been closed. The faculty member in question has resigned from the University and accepted another position.

## **REPORTS TO THE FACULTY SENATE**

Established by the Executive Committee, the program of presentations by the academic Deans has continued. The Senate received extremely informative updates from the Deans of the Law School, the Elliott School, and Columbian College.

The Senate received twelve oral reports. These included an update on the Code of Academic Integrity, a report on the goals of the Office for Advancement, a report on the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, an update on the work of the special Committee on the Alternative Academic Calendar, the annual report by the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee on fiscal year 2003 operating and capital budgets, an update on the Compliance Line and Procedures, a report on administrative salaries, a report on the campus plan and the adverse zoning decisions by the U.S. Court of Appeals, an update on the Gelman, Mount Vernon and Virginia Campus libraries, the annual report on the Recruitment and Appointment of Women Faculty and Faculty of Color, and a report on the Incident Planning, Response, and Recovery Manual.

#### MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION BY SENATE COMMITTEES

Included among numerous items under consideration are the following:

- Service of part-time faculty on Senate Standing Committees (Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee)
- Review of changes to the Faculty Code with respect to the extension of the tenure clock to accommodate parental leave. (Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee)
- Faculty participation in the planning for construction of new academic buildings. (Physical Facilities Committee; Educational Policies Committee)
- Review of policies and procedures with respect to tenure and promotion, including published school and department criteria, mentoring programs, systematic advisement to candidates on progress toward tenure and promotion, and the role of school personnel committees.

This report lists only some of the activities and accomplishments of our colleagues, members of the Senate and volunteer members of its standing committees. They have expended much time and energy on behalf of the University. Since the last meeting of the Faculty Assembly our colleagues, with your assistance and support, have addressed diverse and serious matters of considerable long term impact on the academic enterprise of our University.

Essential to our success as a faculty participating in a shared governance structure is your involvement, the level of which has been extremely high over the last year. It has been exemplified by a substantial increase in the number of colleagues volunteering to serve on committees, contacting of Senate members with respect to a variety of matters, and a general attentiveness to the issues before the Senate. The latter is evidenced in the Senate website log, the number of requests, and pages most frequently accessed from within the University. These range from a low of 1439 to a high of 6262 requests per day.

The faculty's main vehicle of expression and action is through the Faculty Senate. It has achieved a long and remarkable record of success through the work of generations of colleagues throughout the University.

On behalf of our Faculty Senate colleagues I extend sincere thanks for your past contributions and continued involvement.

**The Worldly University**  
**By**  
**Stephen Joel Trachtenberg**

Some 2500 years ago, Heraclitus taught us that “change is the only constant.” Actually, a better translation of what he said is “only change endures.” But, no matter: his words, variously adapted and quoted, have been marked down as wise. Few public-speakers if any have not used them at one time or another — and the normal reaction to hearing Heraclitus quoted on the subject of change is general acclaim for the brilliance of his observation. So deep, so universal... so quotable. Change is inevitable. It’s here to stay.

Of course, practically no one believes a word of it — or wants to. Change is often disconcerting or just annoying. Change may be a constant, but for most of us, I think, it is a constant pain in the neck. Why, we often wonder, do we have to change? Or, if we do have change, can’t it be bite-sized and easy to swallow? Well, some changes are small and go down easily enough, and so we adapt to them with little or no discomfort. Others are not.

Last November, I proposed a change in the university calendar. The Study Group—of faculty and staff and students—examining the proposal thought the three 14-week terms I suggested impracticable and has proposed three options for a 14-14-10 system of terms. I have no intention of rehearsing the Study Group’s report in detail. I assume you have read it. Shame on you if you haven’t because it will affect you. It is still a change, smaller than I proposed, but serious and large enough. If you have doubts about its seriousness and size, look at all the questions raised and arguments stated in the report and especially in the many appendices to the report. And take them to heart. We are in for a long period of discussion about the calendar and its many implications, and everyone should be participating in it.

But we’re also in for something else unless we begin to make large and even radical changes in the way we operate universities. And I am not referring only to GW — but to all American universities. What we’re in for is a tsunami, an economic tidal wave that may wash much of what we care about away. Or, if we’re lucky, just a series of storm surges that will take a few of us out to sea at a time — if you can call that luck. We are living in economically difficult times — not a statement that is news to anyone in the room and so common a complaint these days that it has, perhaps, all the punch of a very tired cliché. It also happens to have the rather harder punch of truth.

Our costs are going up. Faculty and staff want raises and money to fund their endeavors. Students want scholarships and quality programs. And the President wants to give them what they want. But our endowment and donations are not keeping pace — or, if they are at any given moment, we cannot be sure they will continue to do so. Tuitions, consequently, are unhappily going up — here and everywhere. But tuition increases barely keep universities even with where they had been, and have the disquieting effect of making students and their parents unhappy and driving some highly qualified students away altogether.

They have become a political matter. The steep price of higher education has moved Representative Howard McKeon, a powerful Republican from California, to propose price controls on universities — and to punish those whose tuition increases exceed the Consumer Price Index. Price controls, as we learned painfully during the Nixon administration, are foolish and do not work. They stifle innovation, investment, and expansion. That does not mean, however, that we should be cavalier about the rising costs of higher education. We should not be — and we are not. We are simply trying to stay even with our own costs, and that is very difficult these days.

Yet when I read about university presidents describing their economic distress, I do not hear imaginative or useful responses. What I read and hear is that we can cut a few courses or furlough a few instructors or close down a department that is not carrying enough water or — unthinkable thought — do away with a vice president or at least a dean. These responses are all the same. “We will be less than we were,” is what they say. The obverse of these responses — we will admit more students and pack more into the classrooms — is also really the same. We will dilute, and so appear to be the same or bigger but actually be less than we were. Not helpful responses, as I said, unless being second-rate is a worthy goal. I don’t think it is.

I want us to be first-rate. And we are, even if U.S. News ranks us number 51...Well, 51 out of — how many is it? 3700 schools? — isn’t bad. And we get better every year. So good for you and good for GW. But being first-rate requires being solvent. It takes investing in professors and their work. It takes a new science facility, for example. It also requires our doing something for which universities are justly famous and rightly proud: to use our powers of thought and reason to look at how we are going to go about our business in the future. I think we need to strip off all our assumptions about how a university proceeds, examine them, keep those traits that work and become us, and discard those that no longer fit. We need to redefine the enterprise that we call a university. There are many possibilities available to us.

That, for example, is why I proposed the alternative calendar last year. It made no sense to me then, and it makes no more sense to me now, to use a calendar that would have accommodated Abraham when he was a schoolboy in Ur of the Chaldees or George Washington when he was certainly not cutting down his father's cherry tree. More to the point, it makes no sense to me not to use our plant and our personnel as fully as possible. What institutions, outside the academy, do this? I can't think of any, with the exception of professional sports. Well, you've heard me say this before, and I'll let the topic be for the moment. But just for the moment.

The calendar is just one topic — or rather one assumption — among many that we should be questioning. It seems to me that an institution, especially a university, that does not regularly question what it is doing and why — questioning its operations and its *raison d'être* — is failing itself and, in the case of a university, is failing its students and scholarship in general. And given how tough times are financially — and may be foreseeably — it is worse than a failing. It is a death wish.

Reconsidering old comforting assumptions and contemplating change may be daunting work, but it's better work than being overcome by change over which we have no control. But you see, I believe we have control over what changes we can make to endure and even to thrive. I hasten to add that it will sometimes be unsettling because we will naturally be looking at practices that are, at least to some minds, hallowed. They are part of university traditions. They are, we might even conclude, what makes a university a university.

I'm not so sure about that. We still have some of the characteristics of the oldest universities — the calendar, again, being one of the most obvious, and a fairly rigid hierarchy among instructors, and certain rather solemn occasions the meaning of which is not always apparent. In a way, I think GW is lucky in having been spared the Gothic architecture of many other American universities. But still there is no doubt in my mind that should a dean from 11<sup>th</sup> century Salerno or 14<sup>th</sup> century Oxford come back here below and look over GW's university bulletin, he would be... probably speechless, and not because we lack flying buttresses. He would not recognize this as a university from the subjects we teach.

Should the deans of Columbian College, our forerunner, do the same, they would probably be stricken just as silent. What we teach has changed — and that is all to the good. The way we teach what we teach — the calendar, the hierarchy, the official solemnities — has not, however changed proportionately. So I am convinced that the deans from Salerno and Columbian would find some comfort — or at least something familiar — in our

culture. We are still working on very old-fashioned models, it seems to me. We are still, though officially a secular institution, behaving like a temporal one. The odor of sanctity is sometimes stifling. Just the title "Dean" is a reminder. It is originally a religious title and came about because the earliest universities were religious institutions.

But we are no longer religious institutions. Even our neighbor Georgetown, though run by the Jesuits, is a very worldly university. It is interesting that Georgetown recently appointed its first president who is not a priest. And just last week, Yeshiva University in New York, the preeminent Jewish institution of higher learning in the United States, celebrated the investiture of its first president who is not a rabbi.

These changes — at both Georgetown and Yeshiva — I am quite sure were hard, very hard, for some people to swallow. Surely, to many in both places these appointments seemed radical, maybe even heretical — and some no doubt scanned the sky for signs of fire and brimstone. But no brimstone has been reported along the Potomac or the East River and life goes on.

In both cases, I am certain, the choices had to do in part with finding more "worldly" leadership. I think we have to look at equivalent changes. Even though GW has been a secular school free of Baptist direction for nearly 100 years now, we could — like our avowedly religious sister institutions — become a little more worldly ourselves.

By that I mean we must admit what we all should know to be the truth. GW, like all universities, exists in a marketplace and thrives on converting money into good works. When times are hard and money is scarce, we should not throw up our hands and say, "Well, I guess we won't thrive." What we should do — what we must do — is what I have been suggesting: look at our culture and our functions and see what we can do about them to make them more efficient. What can we do better? What can we do cheaper? What can we do more efficiently? What can we do without? And what must we keep at all costs?

When I proposed a change in the academic calendar, a chief reason in my thinking was financial and the academic effect: we could increase enrollment without overcrowding the campus, get fuller use of our facilities, and enhance our academic offerings. The response from the Study Group is far short of what I proposed, as I have said, but I look at it as a first step — or even a compromise with change, dread change. But I am willing to predict that some years from now, probably after I have retired, GW and many universities will have a much more sound academic year. We will have it because we will really have no choice. Pro sports may get away with short

seasons or half-years, but they have big TV contracts and rich-guy owners to subsidize them. We have neither. And by the way, the big-time sports universities are finding that their sports programs do not pay off nearly so well as they have been telling us. They certainly don't support the classics and engineering departments.

We are on our own. We will continue to court donors and pursue grants, but, as I said a moment ago, we can never count on those sources as a constant... unless their change from generosity to parsimony is a constant in the sense Heraclitus meant. Not very encouraging, however profound the thought. But if we are on our own, we are not helpless. There are a great many things we can do.

First, we can attract and try to retain better and better students. The freshman writing program, UW20, and the Writing in the Disciplines program should help. The more we engage our students, the more good ones we will keep — and the word will get out as word always does and improve our applicant pool. So I have pinned some very high hopes on our new writing programs. These are changes and like many they will discombobulate some people — they will surely require more work, especially the Writing in the Disciplines courses. But we are here to work.

Second, we have to be more entrepreneurial — I mean we have to be very worldly and find ways, other than charging tuitions, of making money to invest in academic purpose. To some, this is the height of vulgarity and not what a university does. Except for one thing — it is exactly what universities have always done. We have not given away education for free — ever. There has always been a fee, but we call it tuition. There is no reason that we cannot find ways of using our staff and facilities to sell our services in other ways — perhaps not in formal degree programs, but in rigorous instructional or analytic programs that respond to a market need. Sorry to mention the market, but that's where the money is, and we need it. The Crash Analysis Center at the Loudoun Campus is a perfectly good — and respectable — example of what I am describing.

We also have to realize when we are in over our heads — that's part of entrepreneurship. That is why we got out of the medical business, selling off the hospital — we kept a 20% stake — closing down the GW Health Plan, and spinning off the Medical Faculty Associates. The work was noble, but the financial losses were appalling. We simply did not understand the business of delivering medical care — we were in over our heads. So any business we do undertake should be a business we understand. We understand teaching. We understand education.

Third, we really must question specific assumptions — our culture and our operations. Why, for example, does it take us four years to confer a bachelor's degree? Oxford does it in three. With a reformed calendar, so could GW — and by doing so we would actually earn our way with greater turnover while charging our hard-pressed students less money for the same or a better education. And by shifting at the same time to a 4x4 from the 3x5 credit/course ratio, I think we could offer a deeper and more valuable curricular experience — and attract better students year-round, and that includes the summer.

I will resist asking any questions about tenure. It's not a topic for today—or for GW during my tenure. An issue like that needs gestation. Not now. But I predict some day it will come up again for review—if not here first, then eventually at AAU universities.

And why don't we have classes on Friday afternoons and Saturday mornings? Time was, and not so long ago, that was the case. Do we not wish to interfere with an undergraduate weekend social life that starts on Thursday? Will the downtown clubs and fraternity brothers picket us if we do? Why not squeeze more teaching time out of our terms which, as you know, as someone who recalls 18-week long semesters, I think are too short anyway?

Well, maybe that's enough change to contemplate for one day. Or I should say, enough proposals for change to contemplate for one day. And I am merely proposing. The calendar, you see, was only the beginning. In time — and universities are not known for their fleetness — but in some time in the future, and it may be a decade or two, I think many of my proposals will have become the standard fare of universities, and not only GW. What is important is that we decide, here, now, what changes we want to make and then make them. Otherwise, I think we will be impacted by the irrevocable forces of economics — and that is not the change that any of us wants to see. But if we are willing to change and live with the change, then all will be well. We must remind ourselves constantly that we are living in the world as it is, not as we would like it to be. We must make the world, as it is, into what we would like it to be.

Heraclitus said only change endures. It seems to me that we too will endure only if we change. Endure — and then some.

**The George Washington University  
Faculty Assembly  
29 September 2003**

**Highlights of Strategic Academic Initiatives  
by  
Donald R. Lehman  
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs**

**Welcome**

It is always a great pleasure to welcome The George Washington University faculty members back to the fall term of the new academic year and to have an opportunity to focus on our primary responsibility – teaching through learning and discovery. Simultaneously, it is special to see each year the continuing renewal of the faculty ranks with such highly qualified individuals – new colleagues who have started on the path to making teaching and scholarship their life’s work. Our new colleagues and those of us who have been at The George Washington University for a number of years have made a commitment to a life of learning, discovering, and serving. Ultimately, our experiences prepare us for the special responsibility of teaching others how to create, acquire, and disseminate knowledge or to pursue creative endeavors, all ultimately for the purpose of addressing our nation’s needs or of providing our citizenry a path to a fulfilling life. The latter is the essence of our academic mission at GW.

**Introduction**

Speaking about the academic mission at GW leads naturally into the central focus of my remarks for today. My purpose is to inform you about where we stand with our work on the University’s Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence. I want you to leave the Assembly with an understanding of what has been accomplished to date and how we are assuring that we shall stay on course with implementation of the Plan. I shall begin with some brief background.

Underpinning the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence is a “Model for Academic Excellence at GW” put together by the Academic Excellence Strategic Planning Committee. At the core of the Model is a charge to GW’s faculty members that they provide to GW’s students, both undergraduate and graduate, academic challenge that is characteristic of a top-tier institution. The charge is applied across the three levels of education at GW, baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral, while recognizing that GW is also a research university. Ultimately, we want our baccalaureate graduates to have had an education that has its foundations in substantial writing linked to development of oral communication and advocacy, critical thinking, analytical problem solving, computational literacy, and depth of study in their chosen academic major. Post baccalaureate education at GW has brought us name recognition, whether through Law and Medicine or the breadth of masters programs that serve to meet the professional needs of a diverse group of students and organizations. We want to maintain and further

develop the quality of instruction and relevance to national needs associated with GW's graduate certificate and master's degree programs. At the doctoral level, our aim is to offer degrees in areas in which there are faculty members whose research and scholarly activities are recognized externally for excellence. Clearly, the charge before us, as GW faculty members, can keep us fully engaged and challenged for many years into the future, but we must recognize the urgency of its achievement owing to the highly dynamic environment in which we now compete.

Recognizing the urgency of bringing focus to our academic excellence at GW, the Academic Excellence Committee developed a number of proposals on which we are working and on which I shall report today. In addition, the other strategic planning committee, called the Business and Service Committee, provided the groundwork for evaluating and rethinking how to optimize our academic support structure and student services so that students can focus on their academic endeavors without distractions associated with basic functioning. These efforts combined are now manifest in the University's strategic planning document entitled "*Sustaining Momentum, Maximizing Strength.*" By now, you should have received a copy of the full plan document in the mail. Very shortly, all GW faculty members will receive the companion, pocket-size version that you can carry with you for easy reference.

The planning document is organized around the University's six strategic goals. Subdivisions under each goal include objectives, strategies to achieve the goal and objectives, and metrics to assess whether progress is being made towards the achievement of a given goal and its underlying objectives. Within all academic, business, and service areas, assignments have been made as to who is responsible for working on specific strategies, who is responsible for setting the baseline for the specific metrics, and who is responsible for measuring the outcomes on a given timetable. I am sure you will be hearing more about these responsibilities from your respective deans as the academic year evolves. The key is to keep the University's goals in the forefront while remembering that for faculty they sit within the context of the academic vision and mission.

### **Current Implementation Components**

This past year has been a year of extensive work by a number of your colleagues, the deans, and University staff in making the Strategic Plan a living document. I now want to briefly report to you what has been accomplished in six areas:

- University Writing Program
- Doctoral Programs Review
- Strategic Support of Graduate (Doctoral mainly) Students
- Support of the "Signature Programs"
- Strategic Reallocations – 1% Matching
- Faculty Recruitment – Strategically Connected.

*Undergraduate Writing Program – University Writing 20/Writing in the Disciplines*

The aim of the Undergraduate Writing Program is to assure that when our students receive their baccalaureate degree, they have had a rigorous and comprehensive writing experience during their four years at GW. It all begins with the new Freshman University Writing 20 course, in which we enrolled approximately 300 freshmen this fall, and expect to enroll another 400 freshmen this coming spring. These freshmen were selected randomly from incoming CCAS and ESIA students. Ultimately, all freshmen will be required to take this course, no exceptions granted; that is, there will be no opting out for any reason.

The UW 20 course is a one-semester, four-credit course that meets for two 75-minute classes and one 50-minute class. The maximum enrollment in any one section is 15 students. The emphasis is on writing, critique, rewriting, critique, etc., with an ultimate goal of 26 or more pages of finished writing by the end of the term. Great care has been taken in developing the process of assessment of the students' work. All the faculty teaching in the program attended workshops this summer to assure understanding of what is expected and to arrive at as much uniformity in the pedagogical nature of the classes as possible. All this extensive preparation and on-going assessment is the responsibility of Phyllis Ryder, the acting director of the Writing Program, who reports to the Dean of CCAS.

The second component of the Undergraduate Writing Program is "Writing in the Disciplines". The concept is that certain sophomore and junior level courses in the disciplines will be designated as writing intensive and will "fit" into the model of a writing-intensive course as conceived by the Writing Program Task Force. Undergraduate students will be required to take one WID course in each of their sophomore and junior years. Some of you may have heard about this component through the surveys that were done last year, or you may have attended the Writing in the Disciplines Workshop on 12 September 2003 with Jonathan Monroe from Cornell. Our aim is to have a sufficient number of sophomore-level WID courses next academic year to accommodate the 700 freshmen who took University Writing 20 this academic year. It is anticipated that hands-on workshops for faculty who will teach WID courses will be developed in the future and that efforts will be made to facilitate the sharing of best practices among faculty in various disciplines.

Currently, we have started the process of putting together a search committee for the Executive Director of the Writing Program. We shall also begin having an internal search for the Director of the WID Program. Meanwhile, elections for membership on the Writing Program Advisory Committee are taking place within the schools where undergraduates are taught.

Funding for the University Writing Program for 2003-04 consists of \$350,000 of new funds plus an approximately equal amount through reallocations.

### ***Doctoral Programs Review***

The ultimate aim of the doctoral programs review is to determine the top GW doctoral programs on the basis of the nine specialized evaluation criteria and the three criteria for academic excellence used to select the “signature programs.” Programs ranked in the top category are expected to be targeted for investment and development for the purpose of raising them to an even higher level of recognized excellence. After a hard year’s work during academic year 2002-03, the Committee is back at work this year. The committee has already done a preliminary ranking of the programs based on the materials submitted and the evaluation criteria, but now is continuing from last academic year its discussion in detail of each of the 48 doctoral programs. Some programs have been asked to provide further information where the committee felt it did not have a full understanding of some aspect of the material before it. Once the review of individual programs is completed, the dean of each school with doctoral programs will be asked to appear before the committee to discuss their specific programs and the committee’s proposed rankings.

### ***Strategic Support of Graduate Students – Mainly Doctoral Students***

The strategic aims with regard to the support of doctoral students who hold Graduate Teaching Assistant, Graduate Research Assistant, or Graduate Administrative Assistant positions is to assure stipend/salary packages of a minimum of \$15,000 for the academic year, including 18 hours of tuition remission, and to position the humanities and social science departments such that they can commit to an incoming student, who is to be awarded a GTA, GRA, or GAA package, that they will have the support for five years provided their academic performance is satisfactory. The first of these two aims was achieved for the current academic year: All GTA, GRA, and GAA packages that already had 18 hours of tuition and salary or salary and stipend of at least \$8,000 have now been raised to a minimum of \$15,000 stipend/salary. In addition, a few extra packages have been allocated towards the second aim in the American Studies, Economics, History, and Political Science Departments. In total, these additional investments in graduate student support over the last two years total approximately \$2.2M.

Health benefits for GTAs, GRAs, and GAAs have been increased as well. The University now makes a contribution of \$1,000 yearly towards the health benefits of those students holding one of these assistantships.

### ***“Signature Programs”***

The seven signature programs, designated as such through the Academic Excellence Planning work, have just been notified of their additional resources for AY 2003-04. The seven signature programs are the Departments of History and Political Science, the Institute for Public Policy and School of Public Policy and Public Administration, the Transportation Research Institute, the Sigur Center for Asian Studies, the Human Evolution Program, and the Institute for Biomedical Engineering. The total funding is comprised of two parts: funding for graduate students and funding for other items, for example, a faculty line. The allocated graduate student funding is slightly under \$500K

and the “other” funding totals almost \$750K for a total of approximately \$1.25M. Funding in addition to graduate student support includes funding for faculty lines, for field research and travel, for conference and seminar support, for equipment, and for staff salaries. The reports of how funding was used during FY 03 indicate that the use of these funds is addressing the academic excellence strategic aims as they were originally proposed by the program faculty.

### ***Strategic Reallocations***

In FY 03, each academic unit was asked to give back 1% of their overall budget for the purpose of creating a strategic initiatives pool of money. For each dollar returned in Academic Affairs, it was matched by a dollar from the other units of the University for a total pool of \$3M. As part of the budget process this year, each dean was asked to identify their top strategic priority for funding for 2003-04. Besides increases in graduate-student support monies in each of the schools, which totaled \$1.33M, \$1.9M were allocated for the deans’ strategic priorities. A number of these priorities involved the creation of new faculty lines in strategic areas of academic excellence. Other allocations had to do with teaching initiatives like the CCAS Dean’s Seminars. All funds were strategically directed towards addressing the strategic plan goals and priorities. The remaining \$1.1M was used for graduate student stipend increases (\$500K), investment in the signature programs (\$250K), and partial funding of the University Writing Program (\$350K).

### ***Faculty Recruitment – Strategic Connections***

Faculty recruitment is no longer being done by what in the past has been basically a “replacement” approach, but rather by a strategic initiatives approach. Each dean now justifies requests for faculty position recruitment by connecting the request to a strategic objective within her/his school, across schools, or with respect to the University as a whole. As a consequence, departments are in the position of having to align their requests for positions with the strategic directions of the school or University. Faculty lines are being allocated from one area to another, rather than automatically being retained at the point where the vacancy was created. This year saw the first significant reallocation of faculty lines within schools, all consistent with the University’s strategic plan objectives of academic excellence through building on strengths.

### **Resource Development**

By now, it is obvious that the key to successful implementation of the University’s Strategic Plan is resources in the sense of hard dollars. How are these monies to be generated? I see three paths to successful resource generation:

1. New sources of revenue through student enrollments
2. Sources of revenue through externally sponsored research and scholarship
3. Sources of funds through development and advancement.

Increased student enrollments at both the undergraduate level and the graduate level can generate significant new revenue for investment and development of our academic excellence initiatives. At our current discount rates, 100 additional undergraduates generate net revenue of about \$2M, whereas 100 additional graduate students nets about \$1.15M. Therefore, it takes approximately two graduate students to achieve the same return as one undergraduate student, on average. Being a heavily tuition dependent institution makes these sources attractive and provides the rationale behind our interest in fully utilizing our facilities through a possible alternative academic calendar, creating new summer programs in our traditional summer offerings, enhancing our professional master's degree offerings in a co-development format with government agencies, school systems, and industry, and thinking about making our BA-BS/MA-MS five-year programs an attraction for outstanding high-school students considering GW as their undergraduate institution.

Revenue from sponsored projects sources is for the most part designated before the award arrives at GW. However, these designations usually involve summer salaries for faculty, purchases of equipment, monies to support graduate students and postdoctoral scholars, and general infrastructural necessities. Such support permits us to enhance our intellectual environment consistent with our strategic initiatives. It allows us to do things that otherwise would not be possible. There is no doubt that our faculty recognize this based on the FY 2001-02 sponsored-research expenditures of approximately \$105M and the increase this past year to a total of almost exactly \$116M. The faculties are to be congratulated for making this important contribution to the generation of resources for academic excellence at GW.

In the end, the expectation is that academic excellence will bring prestige to The George Washington University. With such prestige, we expect that it might be easier to raise funds for endowed chairs, the naming of buildings, and the naming of schools. Yet, what comes first – the fund-raising or the prestige? I believe that the fund-raising must occur as the prestige grows. We must put forth a new level of rigor towards our fund-raising through prescribed objectives. At the core of this effort, through the leadership of the Advancement Office, must be the University's Board of Trustees, the President, the Vice Presidents where applicable, the Deans, and ultimately the faculties. All of us as a team must understand the academic excellence priorities and be prepared to explain them. It is through such concerted effort and focus that we can achieve the growth of our resources through external advancement activities.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, let me re-emphasize that the challenges lie ahead of us with regard to realizing the fulfillment of our strategic plan for academic excellence. We should not lose sight of the importance of our achieving the goals, for it is through the goals that we shall ultimately be able to serve the nation and the people who are counting on GW to provide the best education possible. Our focus must stay on the academic excellence components that are so solidly embedded in GW's traditions – learning as a lifelong

pursuit, discovering as the foundation for creating new knowledge, and serving to enhance our global community.

Our plan is entitled *Sustaining Momentum, Maximizing Strength*. As I expect you know, momentum is a vector quantity, so it possesses both magnitude and direction. We perceive our momentum magnitude as large and the direction as upward. Over the last 15 years or so, our momentum has positively increased, which is why the direction is upward, but that implies that the force making this possible is positive, thus allowing us to push out of the way the obstacles that place forces against us. A positive force comes from the leadership of President Trachtenberg, the leadership of the deans of the schools, the outstanding contributions of the GW faculty, the service of our staff, and the expectations of our students. Obviously, now is the time for all of us to “push” harder in order to keep the net force positive and thus our momentum’s magnitude increasing in an upward direction.

Thank you.