

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

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
OCTOBER 31, 2003 IN THE MARVIN CENTER, ROOM 309**

Present: Vice President Lehman, Registrar Geyer, Parliamentarian Pagel; Deans Frawley, Futrell, and Tong; Professors Cordes, Duff, Englander, Friedenthal, Gallo, Garris, Griffith, Gupta, Harrington, Klarén, Lee, Packer, Paratore, Paup, Robinson, Sell, Shambaugh, Simon, Swiercz, Watson, Wilmarth, Wirtz, and Zaghloul

Absent: President Trachtenberg, Deans Harding, Katz, Phillips, Scott, Whitaker, and Young; Professors Briscoe, Castleberry, and Marotta

The meeting was called to order by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman at 2:10 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the September 12, 2003 meeting were approved as distributed.

RESOLUTIONS

I. RESOLUTION 03/4, "A RESOLUTION ON THE PROPOSALS FOR AN ALTERNATIVE ACADEMIC CALENDAR"

On behalf of the Educational Policy Committee. Professor Paul B. Duff, Chair, moved the adoption of Resolution 03/4. Professor Duff noted that the Committee had been very busy the past month, and that its Report and Resolution were before the Senate. He also thanked the Senate staff for their work in making the information available to the campus community through the Senate website. He said he saw no need to review the Report or the Resolution in detail, and he invited questions from the Senate.

Professor William B. Griffith, Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee (FP&B) reported that his Committee had reviewed the Alternative Academic Calendar Report, with a particular focus on the financial model, details of which were sketchy in the Report. He also pointed out that two Senate members of the FP&B Committee were present and available to supplement his presentation, Professors Packer and Watson. He also noted that Professor Edward Cherian, a Business School faculty member of the FP&B Committee, was also present at the meeting. Professor Cherian served on the Task Force that generated the report on the calendar, and wished also to address that report.

Professor Griffith said that his Committee had looked at three broad questions about the Alternative Calendar financial model. The first was whether or not the projections of net revenue gain from adopting an alternative calendar (the 14-14-10 and/or the 4 x 4) were reasonably reliable. The Committee quickly concluded that budget and revenue projections were all based on extremely optimistic assumptions, and assumed the changes could be made with almost no degradation of other kinds of revenue streams in the University. This

optimism, he added, did not seem to be supported by the Alternative Academic Calendar Report itself. For example, he said the element of coercion in requiring a mandatory summer session might seriously impact student recruitment, which could mean that it would be harder for the University to raise tuition, or might require the University to seriously increase the discount rate from its present 35%.

In connection with the perceived optimism of revenue projections, Professor Griffith said that FP&B had asked the Director of Summer Sessions whether or not the alternative summer session posed by the plan could be simply laid on top of the existing summer session, with no revenue loss resulting. He noted that in a memorandum to the Committee and Vice President Lehman, the Director, Dr. Donna Scarboro, said it was her view that there would simply be great difficulty in staffing the alternative summer session without seriously compromising the \$10 - \$11 million revenue presently coming in. Yet he added, the Alternative Calendar Report assumes that the summer sessions revenue stream will remain intact.

Another assumption made by the financial model is that students who enroll in the mandatory summer session would then distribute the semesters in which they took the mandatory leave relatively evenly across their four remaining semesters. That would be necessary, he said, for the Report's budget assumptions to work. However, if a very large number of students took leave one semester, and a very small number took leave the next, these assumptions would prove unworkable. So, again, coercive methods, probably harming recruitment, would likely be required to smooth out semesters of leave.

A second aspect of the financial model examined by FP&B was whether or not cost projections were viable. It was extremely difficult, he said, to figure out what the overall impact of various options was on faculty teaching loads, as these were never spelled out.

One way in which the cost estimates are perhaps unreliable is in the cost of hiring new faculty. The report is written in an affirmative way so as to garner support for the proposals, and suggests that under various alternatives, more faculty would be hired. A surprising planning assumption of the model is that, presently, 55% of courses are taught by full-time faculty, and 45% are taught by part-time faculty. The model assumed this ratio would hold constant, and budgeted for the average cost of an associate professor as the average cost of new faculty to be hired. However, FP&B solicited data from the Institutional Research Office and learned that, while undergraduate enrollment has been rising rapidly, and the University has been adding small numbers of new faculty, the pattern is that about 40% of the new hires have been contract faculty. At least in Columbian College, these contract faculty have a higher teaching load than full-time tenured faculty, and they are also brought in at the bottom pay level. Thus, in terms of the overall faculty, as the number of faculty is allowed to grow to meet increasing enrollment, there is a shifting in the faculty base from full-time tenured, to full-time contract and part-time faculty. That probably means, he concluded, that the model's projected costs for faculty are somewhat high, but this tends to make the proposal more attractive.

Professor Griffith also said that that one cost which does not appear in the financial model mentioned in the Educational Policy Report is the cost of duplicating courses in summer, and then in fall and spring, for students forced to take leave from the University. Another cost which is projected in the Report is the cost for office space for new faculty to be hired. As there is no room for these faculty on campus, the University would be forced to secure rental space for them, and thus, it is not clear that cost projections for these expenses are adequate.

A third question examined by FP&B was a question put to them by many faculty, and that was why it was so important for the University to adopt these proposals, and for what purpose the additional revenue would be used. With no specific plans for use of the additional revenue in the Report, the Committee looked at the way in which the University has been using funds it has been raising by rapidly increasing the enrollment while holding the increase in the faculty to some fraction of that enrollment increase. In fairness, he said, a good deal of the revenue that has been raised has been put to significant academic purposes, such as the new buildings for the School of Media and Public Affairs and the Elliott School. A significant investment has also been made in information technology, and the University has begun to construct a new building for the Business School. However, he added, faculty have expressed concern that the University has also spent approximately \$40 million on the Mount Vernon campus, not including \$15 million for athletic fields, and The Hatchet has reported that the University has just purchased two townhouses in Georgetown which it plans to trade for a site for a boathouse for the crew team. Many faculty are concerned, he said, that these sorts of expenditures are not the best uses of this hard-earned revenue, and do not advance the University's academic enterprise.

Professor Griffith concluded his report by saying that the Committee had come to the conclusion that if alternative calendar proposals were adopted and in fact raised additional revenue, this would probably have to be applied to the debt load incurred by the University for the construction projects it has already undertaken, rather than for further academic initiatives. While there are revenue streams resulting from the construction of buildings such as residence halls and the Wellness Center, the cost of constructing academic buildings has become an increasingly large burden on the academic operating budget. The recently chronicled decline in the endowment will continue, he said, and this means much lower endowment support for the operating budget.

Professor Griffith then said he would like to yield the floor to Professor Cherian, who wished to make an observation about the proposals. Professor Cherian declined the invitation and said that he would prefer to save his comments until the Resolution had been considered.

Discussion of Resolution 03/4 followed. Professor Duff noted that two Schools had met and passed resolutions unanimously opposing the proposals for an alternative academic calendar; the School of Business and Public Management resolution had been appended to his Committee's report, and the resolution approved by Columbian College of Arts and Sciences had been placed on the "digital shelf" of the College's website. He added that the School of Engineering (SEAS) faculty had also met to consider the proposals.

Professor Harrington said that, although he had to leave the SEAS meeting before the vote, there were two resolutions under consideration, one concerning the 14-14-10 (mandatory summer session) issue, and another concerning the 4 x 4 curriculum. In both cases, there was no support for these two proposals. The Engineering School, he added, has numerous constraints upon it that Columbian College does not share, in terms of laboratories and in the number of four-credit courses offered, but still, the opposition to the two proposals was unanimous.

Professor Salvatore R. Paratore, faculty Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, noted the presence at the meeting of Mr. Christian Berle, the student Co-Chair. The Joint Committee had formed a subcommittee of faculty and students, he said, which had

produced a Report on the Alternative Academic Calendar, along with an Executive Summary, which he distributed. Both the 14-14-10 and the 4 x 4 proposals had been considered separately, he said. With regard to the mandatory summer session, the subcommittee found that the comment period ending November 1, 2003, was unacceptable as a number of details had not been sufficiently examined, notably enforcement of the mandatory session, and how it would impact student life. The Joint Committee recommended that this issue undergo further investigation and study before plans for future implementation are embarked upon.

As regards the 4 x 4 proposal, the Joint Committee concluded that it was intrigued by this system, but felt it would be most beneficial without the institution of a mandatory summer session. The Committee also noted that this option appears to represent the lowest prospective increase in expected revenue to the University. Finally, he said that in anecdotal evidence coming to the Joint Committee, students had been asking themselves and each other if they would have enrolled at the University if a summer session were required as proposed. An overwhelming majority of people, he added, had indicated that they would not have enrolled at GW under these circumstances. (The Joint Committee Report is attached.)

Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. began by saying that because he represented the Law School, some might think that the School should not concern itself with proposals that primarily affect undergraduates. However, he said, most of the faculty in the Law School believe that their fortunes very much rise and fall with the overall reputation of the University, and that the School is affected both when the University improves, and when it declines. While many law faculty have been extremely pleased in recent years with all of the progress that has been made, particularly in undergraduate education, they are concerned about the impact the alternative academic calendar proposals might have if implemented. He then said that he had no disagreement with the terms of Resolution 03/4.

Professor Wilmarth noted that lawyers are frequently concerned with matters of process, and he said that he wished to comment about this. He wanted to contrast the alternative calendar process with that recently undertaken with regard to the College of Professional Studies. He reminded the Senate that, as that proposal came forward, there was a lot of concern about it, and also a lot of opposition. In fact, he added, a Resolution was passed urging that the proposal not go forward without further faculty consultation, and particularly, consultation which included the Faculty Senate. The administration listened, and the CPS proposal was deferred. The Senate then participated in setting up a joint faculty/administration task force which produced a very thoughtful report.

Many faculty continue to have concerns about whether or not the CPS proposal made sense, and the alternative calendar proposals raise similar concerns, as alluded to by Professor Griffith. Optimistic projections are again being made, with seemingly little concern about worst case scenarios. That said, the CPS proposal was thoroughly vetted through a consultative process with the Senate, and the result was a much better proposal than the original.

Professor Wilmarth stated that the Senate had not been actively involved in setting up the original joint study commission examining the Alternative Calendar, and the Senate had not had the opportunity to comment on the Report until recently. The feeling was, he said, that the University administration might go forward with the proposals at any time after the close of the comment period on November 1st. Professor Wilmarth observed that there were

many untested assumptions in the Alternative Calendar Report, and a lot of concern and unease had been expressed both at the faculty and student levels.

Professor Wilmarth argued that the University should not go forward with the proposals without involving a broad cross-section of faculty through the elected machinery of the Faculty Senate. He added that Resolution 03 /4 states very clearly that faculty want to help the administration in enhancing revenue possibilities, but he warned that it needs to do so in ways that make sense academically, and that will continue to enhance the University's academic reputation without incurring undue risk. The proposals need further study, he said, and the administration should follow the broad consultative process that was helpful with the CPS proposal.

Vice President Lehman asked to make one clarification for the record, having to do with the composition of the Committee which produced the Alternative Academic Calendar Report. He said that he had actually asked Professor Lilien Robinson to have the Executive Committee appoint three faculty members to the Committee, and this was done. Those members, he recalled, actually reported back to the Senate at an intermediate step in the process.

Professor Peter Klarén spoke as a representative of the Elliott School of International Affairs, saying that while the School did not take a vote on the proposals or produce a resolution, the proposals had been discussed at their retreat. He added that he could report that there was strong opposition to both the 14-14-10 and the 4 x 4 proposals.

Professor Robinson said that she found particularly instructive the fact that faculty from diverse backgrounds, and from all over campus, had examined the Alternative Calendar proposals, and had come to the same conclusions. She added that she thought the faculty's conclusions were absolutely accurate.

Professor Robinson then thanked Professor Duff and the members of the Educational Policy Committee for their hard work, as well as Professor Griffith of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee. Similarly, she expressed appreciation to the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, and she noted the lack of support for the Alternative Calendar proposals. Professor Robinson added that she had attended the student forum at which both students and faculty made excellent comments about the proposals. She concluded by saying that she had not seen such a clear unanimity of opinion on campus for a very long time, and that these issues had certainly energized a very large community.

Professor Wirtz spoke to the process as a representative of the School of Business and Public Management, which reached a unanimous conclusion of opposition to the Alternative Calendar proposals. This was remarkable, he added, in that 120 faculty who usually cannot agree on the price of bread came to the same conclusions. The process seems to have brought everyone together in two ways. Professor Wirtz added that he had received numerous very thoughtful responses from his colleagues about the proposals, along with suggestions on improving GW's academic quality. He said that it was quite clear to him that the SBPM faculty is actively invested in the underlying motivation behind the Alternative Calendar Report, and that what they opposed were the Report's proposals, not the advancement of the academic reputation of the University. The SBPM faculty, he added would very much like to continue deliberations on an ongoing basis to see what can be done to improve the quality of a GW education.

Professor Paratore noted the presence of Mr. Kris Hart, President of the Student Association, and asked if he cared to speak to the issue. Mr. Hart thanked Professor Paratore, and said that the Student Association had received the Report and Executive Summary of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, and had taken that into consideration along with the deliberations of a second Committee led by the Student Association Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Student Life. The S.A. had also sought student opinion through the student forum, and through feedback from smaller student groups. Mr. Hart said that he expected that the Student Association would complete its report by November 1st, and that it would be distributed to the student body, the administration, and the Faculty Senate. Mr. Hart then thanked Vice President Lehman for placing four students -- two undergraduate, and two graduates -- on the Alternative Calendar Implementation Committee. He added that at this point, students really do not understand the proposals, and he said he was hopeful that the Student Association could assist in remedying that.

Professor Simon spoke as a representative of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences. He said that the Medical School is similar to the Law School in that it does not enroll undergraduates. He noted that lawyers and physicians always disagree, and that unlike Professor Wilmarth, he was not so concerned with process as he was with the outcome of adopting the alternative calendar proposals. What concerned him most, he said, was that the proposals would sacrifice breadth for depth. A pre-medical student typically must complete a large number of required science courses. Reducing the number of courses from 40 to 32 might reduce the number of electives to 5. It would be unlikely that students could pursue a broad liberal education, which is desirable for health care professionals.

Professor Griffith then called the question, and a vote was taken on the adoption of Resolution 03/4. The Resolution was adopted by unanimous vote, with none abstaining.

Vice President Lehman asked to make a few comments, and began by saying that he wanted to say a few things relative to what has taken place during the last four or five months from his perspective as the University's Chief Academic Officer. First of all, he said that he has heard what the faculty is saying, and has been thinking a lot about their comments and suggestions. In fact, he said, the surveys recently distributed were an attempt to gather additional input and ideas, not only from faculty, but from students as well. He noted that he expected the administration to begin its analysis of survey data the following week, although not all departments had responded with their materials. Vice President Lehman then said that he hoped faculty would encourage those who had not responded to the questionnaires to do so, and he said that he welcomed further input, even from those who had had second thoughts about their first responses to the surveys.

Vice President Lehman said that he thought seeking new ideas to enable the University to make the kinds of investments that would advance the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence and make GW a better institution was a very important exercise. Thus far, he said the institution has been very successful, partly through reallocations of existing funds. Major steps have been taken with regard to increasing the funding for graduate students, as has already been reported. Significant progress has been made in the reviewing of doctoral programs, and the University plans to invest additional funds in those programs that can bring external recognition and prestige to GW for the quality of its programs.

Vice President Lehman also said that his office had received some very interesting and exciting new ideas for summer programs. Something like a dozen or more new initiatives

seem within the realm of possibility, and he added that he hoped these would become a reality by next summer. He said a lot of little deltas in revenue can add up to large deltas in the long term, and he said he hoped faculty would help the administration make the new programs a reality for the coming years. He also said he would do his utmost to see that the revenue generated from these new programs is reinvested right back into academic areas in connection with the priorities that have been set in the Strategic Plan.

Vice President Lehman concluded by saying that it was clear that everyone understands the need to work together from all directions. He said that he hoped the Senate understood that the administration has been trying very hard to work in the most basic of the shared governance ways that are possible at a university like GW. He added that he hoped the faculty would continue to provide suggestions and ideas to the administration, and he said the administration would look into ways where everyone can work together and perhaps find some means of significantly increasing revenue. Large amounts of new revenue would be necessary, he said, to make such things as the construction of a new science building (a project close to his own heart) possible.

Professor Griffith asked about Mr. Hart's remarks concerning students being named to an Alternative Calendar Implementation Committee, and he asked Vice President Lehman if this Committee had been formed. Professor Griffith added that The Hatchet had published stories about this before the November 1st deadline for campus comment on the proposals, and that this left the impression that the President was not waiting on the outcome of the discussion or the returns of inquiries before he decided to move forward to an implementation phase. Vice President Lehman responded that such a Committee had not yet been formed, but that some of the groundwork for such a Committee had been laid. In any case, he said, the idea was that an Implementation Committee would simply study the proposals further, whether the 14-14-10 or the 4 x 4, in order to ensure the University was on solid ground before it moved forward on any particular issue.

Professor Cherian said that he was one of seventeen people who had worked on the Committee which developed the Alternative Academic Calendar Report. He said the Committee had expended a lot of effort, but had created a very bad Report. It was completely flawed, he reported, and he was unsuccessful in persuading his colleagues to make the changes necessary to correct it. He also said that he certainly endorsed what the Senate had just done in approving Resolution 03/4 and that the outcome was correct. With that said, he added that the Committee had begun by trying to suggest better ways of making use of University facilities, but that he thought that there are ways of doing that that the Committee did not address properly. The University certainly does not use its facilities wisely, and the door should not be shut on this issue as there is more work to be done on maximizing the University's investment here.

Professor Paratore asked if all Schools had received the questionnaire, and Vice President Lehman responded that it been sent to all of the undergraduate schools. He added that the surveys could be sent to the other Schools if the Senate saw any merit in that. (The Resolution is attached.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES FOR THE 2003-04 SESSION

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Robinson moved the nomination of the following faculty to Senate Standing Committees: University and Urban Affairs: Professor Joseph Cordes as Chair; Libraries, Professor David Shambaugh. With the consent of the Senate, Professor Robinson also moved the nomination of Professor Tarek El-Ghazawi to the Committee on Admissions, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management. The nominations were approved.

II. NOMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT TO ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES FOR THE 2003-04 SESSION

Professor Robinson moved the nominations of Messrs. Michael Trask and Kip Wainscott for appointment by the President as student members of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students. The nominations were approved.

III. NOMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES TO ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES FOR THE 2003-04 SESSION

Professor Robinson moved the nomination of Professor Joseph Cordes for appointment to the External Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. The nomination was approved.

IV. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Robinson presented the Report of the Executive Committee, which is enclosed.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Griffith expressed his thanks to Professor Paul Duff, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee, for his work in assembling the Report and Resolution on the Alternative Academic Calendar in record time, and he asked the Senate to join him in expressing its appreciation with a round of applause. The Senate obliged.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Dennis L. Geyer
Dennis L. Geyer
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION ON THE PROPOSALS FOR AN
ALTERNATIVE ACADEMIC CALENDAR (03/4)**

WHEREAS, the University administration has requested a faculty response to the Report of the Study Group on An Alternative Academic Calendar at The George Washington University ("the Report"); and

WHEREAS, the response of the Faculty Senate is informed by the opinions of collective and individual faculty throughout the University; and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate believes that the proposed mandatory summer term would hinder the University's strategic objective to recruit and retain high quality undergraduates; and

WHEREAS, the ten-week instructional period of the proposed mandatory summer term would have the effect of mandating that courses which are not necessarily suited to a 10-week compression be taught in 10 weeks nevertheless, requiring faculty and students to rush academic delivery, coverage, and learning of material; and

WHEREAS, the proposed mandatory summer term would place a significant economic and logistical burden on the faculty and on the administration of departments, programs, and schools; and

WHEREAS, the Report's proposals appear inconsistent with the requirement by the U.S. Department of Education's 30-week residency requirement for juniors receiving financial aid and the Department of State's requirements for foreign student visas; and

WHEREAS, the Report does not speak to the important corollary issues involving the impact of these options upon graduate education, upon both faculty and student research, upon faculty governance, and upon service; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate views the proposed increase to four credit hour courses without a commensurate increase in contact time as inconsistent with the educational mission of the University; and

WHEREAS, adoption of the proposed "4x4" alternative would greatly diminish the opportunities for breadth and number of required and elective courses students can take; and

WHEREAS, the Report lacks any sort of Business Plan upon which the economic viability of the proposals could be discussed and evaluated; and

WHEREAS, the Report summarily dismisses potentially viable economic alternatives which would be far more consistent with the academic mission of the University than those alternatives upon which the Report focuses; and

WHEREAS, the four-credit course proposals addressed in the Report would be inconsistent with some state-mandated requirements for some schools, and the impact of the proposals addressed in the Report on other accrediting agencies is presently unknown and would require much further investigation; **NOW, THEREFORE**,

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

- (1) That the specific proposals contained in the Report are not in the best academic interests of the University; and
- (2) That these particular proposals do not carry the endorsement of the Faculty and must not be implemented; and
- (3) That no steps be taken to establish an implementation committee or commence implementation; and
- (4) That the Faculty stands ready and willing to develop with the administration other alternatives which meet specifically identified University needs while maintaining academic integrity; and
- (5) That any summer program remain voluntary for students and faculty; and
- (6) That in conformity with the faculty's Faculty Code mandated responsibilities, any further discussion of the topics of alternative academic calendar and/or summer session restructuring fully involve the Faculty, through its Faculty Senate Representatives, so as to remove the severe academic limitations and ambiguities of the set of proposals in the Report.

Educational Policy Committee
October 16, 2003

Adopted October 31, 2003

Report of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students on the Alternative Academic Calendar

Sal Paratore, *Faculty Co-Chair*
Christian Berle, *Student Co-Chair*

Shaina Schallop, *Chair, Subcommittee on the Alternative Academic Calendar*

The academic mission of The George Washington University is to provide students and faculty with optimal opportunities for the creation, acquisition, and dissemination of knowledge, and the pursuit of creative endeavors to meet the needs and enrich the experiences of a global society. As an academic institution, it is the responsibility of the faculty and the students to address the important issues that will greatly impact the University.

While the implementation of a mandatory summer session has its advantages, it is the recommendation of the JCFS subcommittee on the alternative academic calendar that more time be given to this issue before any plans of implementation are discussed and a final decision rendered. To institute such a program without faculty and student support or concrete, widely known, consistent plans with regard to the specific areas of academics and student life is not only undemocratic but also irresponsible. Without details to how the program will be enforced and student life improved (through public meetings, plans, budget specifications, etc.), the end of the input period on November 1 is found to be unacceptable by the committee. In short, we recommend that this issue undergo further investigation and study before any final plans for future implementation are decided.

The committee analyzed the report of the Study Group on the Alternative Academic Calendar, each of its appendices, and the supplemental report issued by the University Librarian. The committee greatly appreciates Dr. Charles Karelis' availability to meet with the committee, in addition to other members of the administration and the faculty who were responsive to questions issued by the committee and its members.

It is important to recognize, that the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, which has been charged with reviewing all issues that pertain to faculty or students, seeks to fairly represent its constituencies. The Joint Committee chose to create a subcommittee to address the issue in further depth. The issues stated in this report are the collective views organized in representation of student and faculty opinion, and are not solely the direct opinions of the committee's members.

President Stephen J. Trachtenberg, in his address to the Faculty Assembly introducing the issue of an alternative calendar to be discussed, reminded students and faculty of the ancient Chinese proverb, "May you live in interesting times." With that truth undisputed, both inside and out of the academic world, it is important that especially in such 'interesting times,' a university should not rush to judgment. In addition reservations or

analysis of the issue only speaks of the concern of the students and faculty for the future of the University, and not just an opposition to change.

An alternative calendar has the possibility of greatly changing the face of the University, both inside and outside of the classroom. Such a change would make GW different from nearly every other college and university in the country. A difference could very well distinguish the University from other schools in its market, giving an added attraction to students who are considering matriculating at GW. However, such a distinction may make students hesitant to apply or transfer to GW, because of the alternative calendar.

The first issue, which the committee has chosen to address is the proposition that the University would require rising juniors to attend summer courses.

The report detailed a large degree of benefits the additional revenue, brought in by increased enrollment, would lead to support for academic programs. Though the University has not indicated where the increased revenues would be directed, President Trachtenberg and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Don Lehman, and the Study Group report have indicated that it would go at increasing the number of full time faculty, and strengthening numerous other academic programs at the University.

It is also important to note that the impression that has been given to the student body is that the change is based entirely upon the need for new revenue. President Trachtenberg is quoted on numerous occasions that the change is meant to pay for existing programs or demands for resources, such as the addition of a new science facility, or a home for the School of Public Health and Health Services. Further he notes that the University has difficulty raising funds for new programs, because of the conclusion of the capital campaign, and state of the economy.¹ Addressing the Board of Trustees President Trachtenberg stated, "You and I know we are talking about money. If we don't earn it, we can't spend it. If we don't earn it, we can't keep up the momentum." Board of Trustees Chairman Ambassador Charles Manatt echoed the statements of President Trachtenberg, stating, "We cannot continue to enlarge and improve the quality of the GW experience within the (financial) means currently available to us."²

Other potential benefits of the increased revenue could be lessened annual increases in tuition, and increased scholarships and financial aid. The report notes that increased revenue could reduce the gaps that exist between the ability of students' to pay GW tuition and the tuition itself. Cheryl Beil, Executive Director for Academic Planning and Assessment, noted that such 'gapping' leads students to work increased hours, and reduces the time available to focus on their studies. If increased revenue were directed at supporting financial aid, this would be a great benefit to students.

¹ Gordon, Julie, "Analyzing trimesters: Term would raise extra revenue," GW Hatchet, October 20, 2003

² Oinounou, Mosheh, "Trustees discuss boosting revenue," GW Hatchet, October 20, 2003

The report also notes that creating such a mandatory summer would allow the University to increase the number of courses offered to students. A thicker catalogue would mean more curricular options for students and more chances of finding courses that matched individual students' interests. Such a change would respond to students concerns and demands for more courses, and more sections of popular courses.

With a mandatory summer, the University could develop a 'signature program,' with an innovative and engaging academic curriculum, which could not be experienced at other times during the year, or at other institutions. Possibilities for such engagement include using the summer term for an 'introduction experience into the major, using it for intensive directed research, since laboratories would be in less demand, and using it for a mini-capstone course that would pull together the disparate elements of the student's general education in the lower division.'

At Dartmouth College, it is widely argued that requiring an entire class to spend a summer on camp helps foster class spirit, given that nearly all the students on campus will be from will be in the same class. However, unlike Dartmouth, which is a smaller institution in rural New Hampshire, GW is a major metropolitan university. Given the urban and fluid nature of the campus, a required summer session would not easily recreate the class spirit exhibited at Dartmouth.

Also, because of the change to the calendar, there would be a direct impact on extracurricular student life. The report details that at Dartmouth, student groups elect leadership at the beginning of each term, and this provides an opportunity for students to gain leadership opportunities earlier in their college career. For example many students would be able to become editors, organization presidents, and other leadership position. However, present conditions do allow for students to assume leadership positions in student organizations, and in student government. For example, the President of the Student Association, the Chairman of the College Republicans, the Executive Vice Chair of the Program Board, the Chairman Pro Tempore of the Student Association Senate, numerous committee chairs of the Program Board, members of the Colonial Cabinet, countless fraternity and sorority presidents, are all juniors. In addition, there are even numerous examples of students taking leadership opportunities in their sophomore year, as can be seen with six sophomores are members of the Student Association Senate.

However, this raises a number of issues when it comes to the continuity of student organizations, with such a high turnover of leadership. In addition, many students at GW have been able to assume positions in leadership prior to their senior year. For example, the Student Association President was elected as a rising junior, and numerous senators were elected as rising sophomores. It would also prove a financial burden as elections for the Program Board, Marvin Center Governing Board, and the Student Association cost over \$10,000 per election.

The addition of a mandatory summer session gives students the opportunity to use their 'off term' to travel, take a job or internship outside of the University. Possibilities include a political science student by spending the fall on a presidential campaign, or taking a job

as a staff assistant for a senator, congressman, or governor. Chemistry major could intern at any number of national laboratories throughout the country, and learn valuable insights into the world of medicine. An accounting major could intern with a CPA during the spring, when millions of Americans are filing their taxes. These are possibilities that would greatly add to the educational experiences of all students who would take advantage of them.

However, such opportunity already exists because of the current calendar. Many students choose to take time off from school to work on presidential, senatorial, and congressional campaigns. Students choose to volunteer at a high school or with a charity organization. Others spend that time traveling around the world or spending time at home with friends and family. These choices are feasible because students can make up the courses that they missed by taking classes during the summer, during the two existing summer terms. These actions would all be the choices of each student, and not the requirement mandated by the University. If there were a demand for that opportunity, the committee believes that such a desire would be evident by students taking time off, and enlisting in summer programs to make up credit to graduate on time.

President Trachtenberg has suggested that students could utilize their 'off-term' by studying abroad or attending classes at another university. However the report issued by the Study Group clearly states, "since 'taking off' means not studying for credit at GW or elsewhere, the term would be in addition to study abroad in most cases. In effect, rising juniors would be displacing a conventional summer vacation into a subsequent fall or spring."³ This presents a clear contradiction, if the University were to allow students to take credit at another institution during the term which they are 'taking off,' students would likely be more amenable to the proposed changes to the calendar. Additionally, the administration has pointed out that the fall is one of the busiest periods in retail; surely "something happens here" refers to interesting and unique experiences in Washington DC rather than folding sweaters at the GAP in the fall. It is important to note that while GW students do comprise a notable chunk of interns or part time help in the District, businesses cannot be expected to alter their calendar or intern programs to coincide with GW students who have a semester free.

As the University has taken numerous steps to increase its selectivity, and improve its placement in the rankings, it is difficult to understand why the University would desire to admit more students. It is especially concerning to admit students who fall well below the mean SAT, GPA, and extracurricular standards that the University currently holds for students applying to GW. Though previously scheduled, we have not yet had the ability to converse with a member from the office of admissions, which we also find particularly troubling. The committee is concerned that admissions standards will be lowered in order to gain the additional one thousand students, per class, to pay for the change in the calendar.

The report of the Study Group indicated that the Office of Undergraduate Admissions would accept more students from 'the next slice down,' which gave the committee the

³ Ibid, p. 7

impression that these students would not meet the current high standards set by the University for matriculated students. The report also stated that more students could 'be recruited with less financial aid than students in the top slice.' This statement leads the committee to believe that the additional thousand students would not be admitted on the merits of their addition to University, instead that they would be admitted almost entirely on their ability to afford GW tuition. Such a decision in the admissions process does not seem to be in congruence with the academic mission of the University, and the desire to educate students.

The mandatory summer session could create a scenario by which students would be required to be on campus for five semesters in a row, without a significant vacation. This could conceivably develop a high burnout rate for students, which would be detrimental to the academic experience of students.

The summer session is specifically required for 'rising juniors;' however, it does not clarify whether that status is determined by academic credit or by class standing. Many students matriculate at GW with college credit prior to the beginning of their freshman year. Some students come in with between fifteen and thirty credits, and, to be technical, the summer before their junior year would be at the end of their freshman year. The requirement that those students attend a summer session detracts from their connection to their matriculated class. In addition, on occasions students enter school with more than sixty credits, in fact making the summer prior to their junior year, the summer before they even start classes. In this situation, it is unlikely that the University would have any ability to require students to enter this summer session.

There are also the issues of students who fall behind by a semester or more because of a personal illness, family issues, and many other reasons. Their class standing, even if their plans are to graduate in four years, would place them in terms of credit, in a different class than that which they matriculated. This would play a large role to reduce the class spirit that the plan proposes to create.

Lastly, it is important to address the learning that goes on outside the classroom. The bonds formed by students both within their class and with students in actual classes span farther than freshmen, sophomore, junior or senior distinctions. Implementing a mandatory summer session destroys the bonds formed during the year through Greek mixers, SA senate campaigns, and even studying for midterms late at night in the Gelman library study rooms. Other options successful at schools like the University of Maryland at College Park include a winter session during the holiday season, where students have the option of a four-week session to catch up on a class or two. It is wildly popular and many students take advantage of their proximity to DC to take only three or four classes a semester and intern in the District with the intent to take a fifth in that winter session. We feel that even an optional summer session at a lower tuition rate could be a viable solution to need to increase revenue at GW. Furthermore, the idea of an optional term eliminates special treatment for athletes; already privy to early registration, they would have the option of skipping the mandatory summer entirely. Would this affect other "priority" student groups like honors students or even pep band members? Would the

entire University try out to be a member of the pep band or an athletics team to be excused from the summer session? We feel this is a slippery slope; what about the VIP or Curious Minds Rock counselors who work all summer? There would be fewer juniors in these programs, possibly affecting the quality of staff in the admissions office over the summer. CI group leaders would not be juniors if the mandatory summer were instituted, leaving out an incredible group of leaders. On such a slippery slope, where do we draw the line?

Though it is important to recognize that many concerns could be ironed out during the possible 'implementation process,' it is critical to understand that the levels of energy and resources required for such a change. The Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence outlines a number of ways where the University is planning on improving the academic experience of students, while strengthening GW's status as a research institution. This is happening while the office of the Executive Vice President and Treasurer and the division of Student and Academic Support Services are launching efforts to improve customer service across the University. The committee is concerned that many positive and groundbreaking initiatives such as the degree audit program and the proposed merger of the Student Association's Academic Update with the departmental course evaluations, and numerous other programs would be abandoned because of the focus that would be needed to implement the new calendar.

It is important to address the impact of a mandatory summer on student services, which are already a complaint amongst students. The Gelman Library System issued a supplemental report raising a number of concerns for all students and faculty. The resources are already taxed heavily because of the high rate of inflation in the cost of books and collections. The library operates on the condition of restricting time off for significant vacation time to the summer months, because of the lessened demand on the libraries. Most of the classes taken during this period would be upper level courses, which require more outside research that would lead to increased use of the library. It has been proposed that the Gelman Library would need an additional \$550,000 just to increase the size of their staff and operations to deal with the increased demand. Also, the committee feels strongly that that these increases in funds not count against any increase that they receive to adjust to inflationary costs. Also, the collection size and services should increase due to the increased size of the undergraduate population.

It is also critical to keep the Career Center open during the summer, especially because the plan suggests that students take jobs or internships during their 'off-term.' Also, the signature program that the University hopes to create does underline an increased focus on helping students find strong internships, and the Career Center will be in much higher demand to accommodate such expectations. Also, the Career Center would have to expand its focus to help students obtain internships outside of Washington, DC, as many of the students will not be living in the District during their off term.

The required 'off-term' would greatly displace the time where many students are preparing for their post-graduate work. Numerous students spend their junior year applying for Fulbright, Marshall, Rhodes, and Truman Scholarships, among many others.

Students take and prepare for LSATs, GREs, MCATs, GMATs and other entrance exams during the time, which they could be required to 'take off.' The separation away from the University and its many services, such as the Counseling Center, University Honors Program and Office of National Fellowship Competitions would be detrimental to their ambitions for post-graduate work.

It is also important to note that another option investigated by the committee was a four by four system with a mandatory summer session. While the four by four could be a great addition to GW, there are several concerns we would like to note that point to the need for further investigation. Primarily, a four by four system would theoretically allow students to take a more in-depth look at a subject by taking only four as opposed to five classes each semester. However, the original report does not specify any additional class time granted to students; consequently, what will comprise the extra credit (3 to 4 credit classes)? We feel that this increase in class time must be substantial to justify the addition of an extra credit hour per class. This extra time would enable both the professor and the student to spend more time on topics they enjoy and explore the subject matter in greater detail.

Lastly, the committee is particularly concerned with the reduction in course offerings by a possible ten percent with the institution of a four by four grid. This would cause major reorganization on the part of the faculty; for example, many professors have pointed out that it is extremely difficult to remove course A and distribute appropriate topics to courses B and C. This change would require rigorous activity on the part of each individual department, a change that should be thought through before implemented. However, one aspect of the four by four system that we do like is the increased flexibility that comes with taking fewer courses. Students could have the option of working part time or even interning in the time that they would normally be in their fifth class. Though we are intrigued by this system, we feel it would be most beneficial without the institution of the mandatory summer session. Unfortunately, this option presented the lowest increase in expected revenue according to the excel models.

Given the previously stated reasons, The Joint Committee of Faculty and Students recommends that the ideas for the implementation of a mandatory summer session and the four by four academic credit system, be placed under further review. While both recommendations have their advantages, the possible shortcomings of the programs must be addressed and presented to the student body and faculty before any such proposals are implemented. Therefore the committee cannot recommend an adoption of the alternative calendar proposals.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

October 31, 2003

LILIEN F. ROBINSON, CHAIR

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee has spent significant time discussing the academic calendar proposals, their possible consequences for the academic programs of the University and for the faculty, as well as possible faculty responses. At the same time, it has seen its present role as assisting the Educational Policy Committee, to which the matter was primarily assigned. The Executive Committee has also sent a letter to the President and the Academic Vice President expressing the concerns of faculty colleagues over the questionnaire that was distributed to the faculty and students. (The letter is attached.)

The Executive Committee has received, but not yet reviewed, a report from the Senate Research Committee that addresses the alternative academic calendar proposals with respect to research.

The Executive Committee appointed David Robinson, Professor Emeritus of Law, to serve on the Educational Policy Committee in connection with the deliberations on the Alternative Academic Calendar.

The Executive Committee also appointed Professor Linda Gallo, Chair of the Senate's Physical Facilities Committee, to serve on a Committee established by the President to examine campus traffic safety issues following a recent student pedestrian injury.

The Executive Committee has invited Associate Vice President Jean Folkerts to the November Faculty Senate meeting. She will be providing an update on the recently established Office of Special Academic Initiatives.

MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Pursuant to established practice, the report of the Faculty Senate was presented by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees at their October meeting. Copies of that report are being provided to Senate members. (The Report is attached.)

FACULTY SENATE PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDENT FORUM ON THE ALTERNATIVE ACADEMIC CALENDAR

The Faculty Senate was represented at the recent student forum on the Alternative Academic Calendar by Professors Joseph Cordes and Laura Youens, a member of the Educational Policy Committee, and myself. Along with representatives of the Administration and the Student Association we were panel participants. The discussion among panelists and with a very highly engaged student audience was very informative.

FACULTY CODE

The republication of the Faculty Code is in the last phase of the process at the University's Graphics Office. The expectation is that it will be available for distribution in December.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next regular Senate meeting will be held on November 14, 2003. The agenda for this meeting will be distributed early next week.

Report of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students on the Alternative Academic Calendar

Sal Paratore, *Faculty Co-Chair*
Christian Berle, *Student Co-Chair*

Shaina Schallop, *Chair, Subcommittee on the Alternative Academic Calendar*

The academic mission of The George Washington University is to provide students and faculty with optimal opportunities for the creation, acquisition, and dissemination of knowledge, and the pursuit of creative endeavors to meet the needs and enrich the experiences of a global society. As an academic institution, it is the responsibility of the faculty and the students to address the important issues that will greatly impact the University.

While the implementation of a mandatory summer session has its advantages, it is the recommendation of the JCFS subcommittee on the alternative academic calendar that more time be given to this issue before any plans of implementation are discussed and a final decision rendered. To institute such a program without faculty and student support or concrete, widely known, consistent plans with regard to the specific areas of academics and student life is not only undemocratic but also irresponsible. Without details to how the program will be enforced and student life improved (through public meetings, plans, budget specifications, etc.), the end of the input period on November 1 is found to be unacceptable by the committee. In short, we recommend that this issue undergo further investigation and study before any final plans for future implementation are decided.

The committee analyzed the report of the Study Group on the Alternative Academic Calendar, each of its appendices, and the supplemental report issued by the University Librarian. The committee greatly appreciates Dr. Charles Karelis' availability to meet with the committee, in addition to other members of the administration and the faculty who were responsive to questions issued by the committee and its members.

It is important to recognize, that the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, which has been charged with reviewing all issues that pertain to faculty or students, seeks to fairly represent its constituencies. The Joint Committee chose to create a subcommittee to address the issue in further depth. The issues stated in this report are the collective views organized in representation of student and faculty opinion, and are not solely the direct opinions of the committee's members.

President Stephen J. Trachtenberg, in his address to the Faculty Assembly introducing the issue of an alternative calendar to be discussed, reminded students and faculty of the ancient Chinese proverb, "May you live in interesting times." With that truth undisputed, both inside and out of the academic world, it is important that especially in such 'interesting times,' a university should not rush to judgment. In addition reservations or

analysis of the issue only speaks of the concern of the students and faculty for the future of the University, and not just an opposition to change.

An alternative calendar has the possibility of greatly changing the face of the University, both inside and outside of the classroom. Such a change would make GW different from nearly every other college and university in the country. A difference could very well distinguish the University from other schools in its market, giving an added attraction to students who are considering matriculating at GW. However, such a distinction may make students hesitant to apply or transfer to GW, because of the alternative calendar.

The first issue, which the committee has chosen to address is the proposition that the University would require rising juniors to attend summer courses.

The report detailed a large degree of benefits the additional revenue, brought in by increased enrollment, would lead to support for academic programs. Though the University has not indicated where the increased revenues would be directed, President Trachtenberg and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Don Lehman, and the Study Group report have indicated that it would go at increasing the number of full time faculty, and strengthening numerous other academic programs at the University.

It is also important to note that the impression that has been given to the student body is that the change is based entirely upon the need for new revenue. President Trachtenberg is quoted on numerous occasions that the change is meant to pay for existing programs or demands for resources, such as the addition of a new science facility, or a home for the School of Public Health and Health Services. Further he notes that the University has difficulty raising funds for new programs, because of the conclusion of the capital campaign, and state of the economy.¹ Addressing the Board of Trustees President Trachtenberg stated, "You and I know we are talking about money. If we don't earn it, we can't spend it. If we don't earn it, we can't keep up the momentum." Board of Trustees Chairman Ambassador Charles Manatt echoed the statements of President Trachtenberg, stating, "We cannot continue to enlarge and improve the quality of the GW experience within the (financial) means currently available to us."²

Other potential benefits of the increased revenue could be lessened annual increases in tuition, and increased scholarships and financial aid. The report notes that increased revenue could reduce the gaps that exist between the ability of students' to pay GW tuition and the tuition itself. Cheryl Beil, Executive Director for Academic Planning and Assessment, noted that such 'gapping' leads students to work increased hours, and reduces the time available to focus on their studies. If increased revenue were directed at supporting financial aid, this would be a great benefit to students.

¹ Gordon, Julie, "Analyzing trimesters: Term would raise extra revenue," GW Hatchet, October 20, 2003

² Oinounou, Mosheh, "Trustees discuss boosting revenue," GW Hatchet, October 20, 2003

The report also notes that creating such a mandatory summer would allow the University to increase the number of courses offered to students. A thicker catalogue would mean more curricular options for students and more chances of finding courses that matched individual students' interests. Such a change would respond to students concerns and demands for more courses, and more sections of popular courses.

With a mandatory summer, the University could develop a 'signature program,' with an innovative and engaging academic curriculum, which could not be experienced at other times during the year, or at other institutions. Possibilities for such engagement include using the summer term for an 'introduction experience into the major, using it for intensive directed research, since laboratories would be in less demand, and using it for a mini-capstone course that would pull together the disparate elements of the student's general education in the lower division.'

At Dartmouth College, it is widely argued that requiring an entire class to spend a summer on camp helps foster class spirit, given that nearly all the students on campus will be from will be in the same class. However, unlike Dartmouth, which is a smaller institution in rural New Hampshire, GW is a major metropolitan university. Given the urban and fluid nature of the campus, a required summer session would not easily recreate the class spirit exhibited at Dartmouth.

Also, because of the change to the calendar, there would be a direct impact on extracurricular student life. The report details that at Dartmouth, student groups elect leadership at the beginning of each term, and this provides an opportunity for students to gain leadership opportunities earlier in their college career. For example many students would be able to become editors, organization presidents, and other leadership position. However, present conditions do allow for students to assume leadership positions in student organizations, and in student government. For example, the President of the Student Association, the Chairman of the College Republicans, the Executive Vice Chair of the Program Board, the Chairman Pro Tempore of the Student Association Senate, numerous committee chairs of the Program Board, members of the Colonial Cabinet, countless fraternity and sorority presidents, are all juniors. In addition, there are even numerous examples of students taking leadership opportunities in their sophomore year, as can be seen with six sophomores are members of the Student Association Senate.

However, this raises a number of issues when it comes to the continuity of student organizations, with such a high turnover of leadership. In addition, many students at GW have been able to assume positions in leadership prior to their senior year. For example, the Student Association President was elected as a rising junior, and numerous senators were elected as rising sophomores. It would also prove a financial burden as elections for the Program Board, Marvin Center Governing Board, and the Student Association cost over \$10,000 per election.

The addition of a mandatory summer session gives students the opportunity to use their 'off term' to travel, take a job or internship outside of the University. Possibilities include a political science student by spending the fall on a presidential campaign, or taking a job

as a staff assistant for a senator, congressman, or governor. Chemistry major could intern at any number of national laboratories throughout the country, and learn valuable insights into the world of medicine. An accounting major could intern with a CPA during the spring, when millions of Americans are filing their taxes. These are possibilities that would greatly add to the educational experiences of all students who would take advantage of them.

However, such opportunity already exists because of the current calendar. Many students choose to take time off from school to work on presidential, senatorial, and congressional campaigns. Students choose to volunteer at a high school or with a charity organization. Others spend that time traveling around the world or spending time at home with friends and family. These choices are feasible because students can make up the courses that they missed by taking classes during the summer, during the two existing summer terms. These actions would all be the choices of each student, and not the requirement mandated by the University. If there were a demand for that opportunity, the committee believes that such a desire would be evident by students taking time off, and enlisting in summer programs to make up credit to graduate on time.

President Trachtenberg has suggested that students could utilize their 'off-term' by studying abroad or attending classes at another university. However the report issued by the Study Group clearly states, "since 'taking off' means not studying for credit at GW or elsewhere, the term would be in addition to study abroad in most cases. In effect, rising juniors would be displacing a conventional summer vacation into a subsequent fall or spring."³ This presents a clear contradiction, if the University were to allow students to take credit at another institution during the term which they are 'taking off,' students would likely be more amenable to the proposed changes to the calendar. Additionally, the administration has pointed out that the fall is one of the busiest periods in retail; surely "something happens here" refers to interesting and unique experiences in Washington DC rather than folding sweaters at the GAP in the fall. It is important to note that while GW students do comprise a notable chunk of interns or part time help in the District, businesses cannot be expected to alter their calendar or intern programs to coincide with GW students who have a semester free.

As the University has taken numerous steps to increase its selectivity, and improve its placement in the rankings, it is difficult to understand why the University would desire to admit more students. It is especially concerning to admit students who fall well below the mean SAT, GPA, and extracurricular standards that the University currently holds for students applying to GW. Though previously scheduled, we have not yet had the ability to converse with a member from the office of admissions, which we also find particularly troubling. The committee is concerned that admissions standards will be lowered in order to gain the additional one thousand students, per class, to pay for the change in the calendar.

The report of the Study Group indicated that the Office of Undergraduate Admissions would accept more students from 'the next slice down,' which gave the committee the

³ Ibid, p. 7

impression that these students would not meet the current high standards set by the University for matriculated students. The report also stated that more students could 'be recruited with less financial aid than students in the top slice.' This statement leads the committee to believe that the additional thousand students would not be admitted on the merits of their addition to University, instead that they would be admitted almost entirely on their ability to afford GW tuition. Such a decision in the admissions process does not seem to be in congruence with the academic mission of the University, and the desire to educate students.

The mandatory summer session could create a scenario by which students would be required to be on campus for five semesters in a row, without a significant vacation. This could conceivably develop a high burnout rate for students, which would be detrimental to the academic experience of students.

The summer session is specifically required for 'rising juniors;' however, it does not clarify whether that status is determined by academic credit or by class standing. Many students matriculate at GW with college credit prior to the beginning of their freshman year. Some students come in with between fifteen and thirty credits, and, to be technical, the summer before their junior year would be at the end of their freshman year. The requirement that those students attend a summer session detracts from their connection to their matriculated class. In addition, on occasions students enter school with more than sixty credits, in fact making the summer prior to their junior year, the summer before they even start classes. In this situation, it is unlikely that the University would have any ability to require students to enter this summer session.

There are also the issues of students who fall behind by a semester or more because of a personal illness, family issues, and many other reasons. Their class standing, even if their plans are to graduate in four years, would place them in terms of credit, in a different class than that which they matriculated. This would play a large role to reduce the class spirit that the plan proposes to create.

Lastly, it is important to address the learning that goes on outside the classroom. The bonds formed by students both within their class and with students in actual classes span farther than freshmen, sophomore, junior or senior distinctions. Implementing a mandatory summer session destroys the bonds formed during the year through Greek mixers, SA senate campaigns, and even studying for midterms late at night in the Gelman library study rooms. Other options successful at schools like the University of Maryland at College Park include a winter session during the holiday season, where students have the option of a four-week session to catch up on a class or two. It is wildly popular and many students take advantage of their proximity to DC to take only three or four classes a semester and intern in the District with the intent to take a fifth in that winter session. We feel that even an optional summer session at a lower tuition rate could be a viable solution to need to increase revenue at GW. Furthermore, the idea of an optional term eliminates special treatment for athletes; already privy to early registration, they would have the option of skipping the mandatory summer entirely. Would this affect other "priority" student groups like honors students or even pep band members? Would the