

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**  
**Washington, DC**

**The Faculty Senate**

**April 6, 2006**

**The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, April 14, 2006 at 2:10 p.m. in the Alumni House, First Floor, 1925 F Street, N.W.**

**AGENDA**

- 1. Call to order**
- 2. Short recess for the purpose of having a group photograph taken of the 2005-06 Faculty Senate**
- 3. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of March 10, 2006, as distributed**
- 4. Resolutions:**  
  
**A RESOLUTION ON LIBRARY ENDOWMENT FUNDS (05/7);  
Professor Isabel R. Vergara, Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries  
(Resolution 05/7 attached)**
- 5. Introduction of Resolutions**
- 6. Report by faculty representatives on the deliberations of the Budget Working Group: Professor William B. Griffith**
- 7. Report by faculty representatives on the work of the 4 x 4 Curriculum Task Force**
- 8. Proposed Strategic Plan for the Honors Program: Grae Baxter, Executive Director, Undergraduate Honors, Fellowships and Research; Leslie Jacobson, Chair, University Honors Program Advisory Committee (Strategic Plan attached)**
- 9. Report on Classroom Scheduling for the Fall Semester, 2007: Elizabeth A. Amundson, Registrar**
- 10. General Business:**
  - a) Nominations for election of the following nominees to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for the 2006-07 Session proposed by the Nominating Committee, Professor Philip W. Wirtz, Convener: Professor Lilien F. Robinson (CCAS), as Chair; Professor Brian L. Biles (SPHHS), Professor Michael S. Castleberry (GSEHD) Professor Ernest J. Englander (SB), Professor Charles A. Garris, Jr. (SEAS), Professor Robert W. Rycroft (ESIA), Professor Gary L. Simon (SMHS), Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. (GWLS)**

- b) **Nominees for election to the Dispute Resolution Committee for three-year terms commencing May 1, 2006: Professors Ravi S. Achrol, Brian L. Biles, Patrick Cook, and Milos Doroslovacki. Nominee for Chair: Professor Kurt J. Darr, for a one-year term**
  - c) **Nominees for appointment by the President to the following Administrative Committees: Committee on the Judicial System (for a two-year term): Michael S. Castleberry, Chair; University Hearing Board: Professors Katherine Goodrich and David Truncellito; Marvin Center Program Board: Professor Stuart Umpleby; Marvin Center Governing Board: Professors Bradley Sabelli, Stephen McGraw, Julie Ryan, and Catherine Turley**
  - d) **Report of the Executive Committee: Lilien F. Robinson, Chair**
  - e) **Annual Reports of Senate Standing Committees**
11. **Brief Statements (and Questions)**
12. **Adjournment**

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*  
Elizabeth A. Amundson  
Secretary

**Attachments**

## **A RESOLUTION ON LIBRARY ENDOWMENT FUNDS (05/7)**

- Whereas, The George Washington University aspires to “move solidly into the ranks of first-tier educational institutions” (Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, Goal 1); and
- Whereas, the University further seeks to “strengthen GW’s infrastructure, including the University’s libraries” (Goal 5); and
- Whereas, neither goal can be attained without first-tier library resources; and
- Whereas, both endowments and university allocations are vital sources of funding for the libraries; and
- Whereas, funding for the Gelman Library System from both endowments and university allocations are significantly lower than libraries at peer institutions (see attachment # 1); and
- Whereas, surveys of faculty and students have consistently shown dissatisfaction with the depth and breadth of the collection of the Gelman Library (see attachment # 2 for faculty responses); and
- Whereas, it is in the interest of the Faculty Senate and the University that library resources available for research and instruction be of the highest quality;  
NOW, THEREFORE

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

1. That the University Administration request that the University Librarian provide a 5-year plan through which, by gradual increases in the library collection budget beginning in FY 2008, the collection budget will reach a level equal to the mean level of ARL libraries in GW’s market basket group; and
2. That the University Administration prepare an annual report for the Faculty Senate on its progress in meeting the goals set out in the 5-year plan provided by the University Librarian; and
3. That the University Administration further makes the Gelman Library System a high priority in fundraising in order to increase the endowment for it so as to help meet the goals set out in Resolving Clause 1.

Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries  
March 31, 2006

# ATTACHMENT # 1

## FY 2004 Academic Library Endowments (excluding Law and Medical Libraries)

<u>University</u>	<u>Endowment</u>
1. Northwestern	\$55,000,000
2. Southern California	44,000,000
3. Brown	43,000,000
4. Washington-St Louis	42,000,000
5. Notre Dame	34,000,000
6. Texas-Austin	33,000,000
7. North Carolina	30,000,000
8. Texas A&M	25,000,000
9. Duke	25,000,000
10. Washington	25,000,000
11. California-San Diego	24,500,000
12. Illinois-Urbana	19,000,000
13. Georgetown	19,000,000
14. Kentucky	18,000,000
15. Rochester	18,000,000

16. Virginia	17,000,000
17. Pittsburgh	15,000,000
18. Tennessee	14,000,000
19. Vanderbilt	14,000,000
20. Utah	11,000,000
21. Ohio	11,000,000
22. Kansas State	10,500,000
23. California-Los Angeles	10,000,000
24. Georgia	9,000,000
25. Missouri-Columbia	9,000,000
26. Oregon	7,500,000
27. Kansas	7,500,000
28. Georgia Tech	4,000,000
<b>29. George Washington</b>	<b>4,000,000</b>
30. Iowa State	4,000,000
31. California-Santa Barbara	3,500,000
32. Arkansas	3,500,000
33. Maryland-College Park	3,500,000
34. Nebraska	3,500,000
35. Case-Western Reserve	3,500,000

36. California-Santa Cruz	3,500,000
37. California-Davis	3,000,000
38. Washington State	2,500,000
39. Connecticut	2,000,000
40. Oklahoma State	2,000,000
41. Arizona State	1,900,000
42. Wayne State	1,900,000
43. Washington State	1,750,000
44. Southern Illinois	1,500,000
45. Michigan State	1,000,000
46. Virginia Tech	1,000,000
47. SUNY-Albany	850,000

March 2006

# ATTACHMENT # 2

## Faculty LibQUAL+ Survey—A brief summary

### Background

In the Spring of 2003, the Gelman Library participated in LibQUAL+, a national web-based survey administrated by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in collaboration with the Texas A&M Libraries. The survey seeks to measure library user perceptions and expectations. The objective of LibQUAL+ is to measure the patron's level of satisfaction. This is accomplished by establishing a "zone of tolerance" or the range of acceptable service and then plotting the library's perceived service level. Patrons are asked to rate their minimum level of service followed by their desired level of service for each question. The distance between the minimum and the desired levels represents the zone of tolerance. They are then asked to rate their perceived level of service, and responses are charted, showing the "gap" between perceived, minimum and desired levels of service.

For this survey, we sent random e-mails to 4,916 patrons, including 760 faculty. We received 128 responses from faculty or a response rate of 17%. The established target response rate for the survey was 12%.

### Access to Information Questions

There were five questions relating to access to information:

- Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work
- Convenient service hours
- The printed library materials I need for my work
- The electronic information resources I need
- Timely document delivery/interlibrary loan

### Overall Results

Overall, GW patrons expressed dissatisfaction with journal collections. The dissatisfaction of GW patrons was significantly more than our market basket institutions. While undergraduates at market basket institutions expressed moderate satisfaction with journal collections, GW undergraduates expressed dissatisfaction and our journal collections did not meet their minimum expectations.

GW faculty expressed particularly high levels of dissatisfaction with the availability of journals, books, and the accessibility of resources from the home or office. Both the highest demand and desire is for the accessibility of electronic

resources from their home or office. A full analysis is available at:  
<http://www.gwu.edu/gelman/libqual/results/libqual/index.html>

## **Composite/market basket comparison**

- The GW composite expressed tremendously lower satisfaction with printed materials, group study space and a getaway for study, learning or research when compared with the overall ARL average. Other areas that are considerably lower than other ARL institutional results include: journals, e-resources, quiet space for individual study, and modern equipment.
- The GW composite expressed dissatisfaction with four out of twenty-five questions: printed materials, journals, e-resources, and accessibility from home or office. These areas do not meet the minimum expectations of the GW composite and are perceived to be inadequate.
- The GW composite expressed considerably lower satisfaction with printed materials, journals group study space, modern equipment, and accessibility from home or office when compared with the Market Basket average.

## **Disciplines/faculty responses**

### Business and Social Sciences

- GW business faculty are generally dissatisfied with the Library. GW business faculty expectations are consistently higher than the GW faculty average.

GW business faculty expressed tremendous dissatisfaction with Access to Information (collections), while most other GW faculty expressed a moderate dissatisfaction. GW business faculty are very dissatisfied with the collection, especially with the journals.

GW business faculty members expressed dissatisfaction with 18 out of 25 questions. They expressed extremely high dissatisfaction toward journals, e-resources, and making electronic resources accessible from their home or office.

- GW social science faculty members expressed dissatisfaction with 7 out of 25 questions. They expressed high dissatisfaction with journals and printed materials. They also expressed dissatisfaction with e-resources,

the library web site, convenient access to library collections, making electronic resources accessible from my home or office, and the library as a getaway for study, learning, or research. These areas do not meet the minimum expectations of GW social science faculty and are perceived to be inadequate.

### Engineering and Science

- GW engineering faculty members expressed dissatisfaction with 12 out of 25 questions. They expressed very high dissatisfaction with printed materials, e-resources, library staff who deal with users in a caring fashion, library staff who understand the needs of their users, the library web site, making information accessible from the home or office, and making information easily accessible for independent use. These areas do not meet the minimum expectations of GW engineering faculty and are perceived to be inadequate.
- GW science faculty expectations are consistently lower than the GW faculty average except for a slightly higher demand in the physical library.
- GW science faculty members expressed dissatisfaction with 16 out of 25 questions. The areas with high dissatisfaction include: journals, printed materials, e-resources, timely document delivery / interlibrary loan , the library web site, and making information accessible from their home or office. These areas do not meet the minimum expectations of GW science faculty and are perceived to be inadequate.

# **The George Washington University Honors Program**

## *Fulfilling the Promise*

### *A Proposed Strategic Plan for the Next Decade*

**(Revised)**

“The University Honors Program...should be the crucible for experimentation, advancement, and academic excellence.”

~ Report of the Program Review Committee~

March 31, 2006

***UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE***

***This proposed strategic plan was developed and respectfully submitted in August 2005 by the 2004-2005 University Honors Program Advisory Committee :***

Columbian College of Arts and Sciences

Leslie R. Jacobson, Chair

Professor of Theatre and Chair, Department of Theatre and Dance

Ingrid Creppell, Associate Professor of Political Science

Gayle Wald, Associate Professor of English

John Ziolkowski, Professor of Classics

Elliott School of International Affairs

Hugh Agnew, Associate Dean, Associate Professor of History and International Affairs

Peter Klaren, Professor of History and International Affairs

School of Business

Leo Moerson, Associate Professor of Accountancy and Business Law

School of Engineering and Applied Science

Sameh Badie, Assistant Professor of Engineering and Applied Science

Martha Pardavi-Horvath, Professor of Engineering and Applied Science

School of Public Health and Health Services

Patricia Sullivan, Professor of Exercise Science

Mount Vernon Campus

Rachelle Heller, Professor of Engineering and Applied Science, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Mount Vernon Campus

## **Introduction**

The following proposed strategic plan for the University Honors Program is the outcome of two years' endeavor. It is informed by the findings of an intensive academic program review; the opinions and insights of honors students, honors faculty, deans of the undergraduate schools and other stakeholders; national standards for honors programs; undergraduate curriculum reforms recently instituted at other prestigious universities; and GW's top students' experiences in recent national undergraduate fellowship competitions. The plan is intended to meet the aspirations of the University's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence; to better serve a select group of talented students who seek an enhanced academic experience at GW; and to integrate the program into the University's academic mainstream. In the words of the University Honors Program Review Committee, the Honors Program should be "the crucible for experimentation, advancement, and academic excellence".

It is important to recognize at the outset that these proposals, if adopted and implemented, will substantially restructure and reposition the Honors Program within the University. Over the 15 years of its history, the program has quite rightly evolved in deference and accommodation to the needs and requirements of the schools. It exists to serve them. At the same time, that same deference and those same accommodations have rendered the program vulnerable to criticisms regarding the distinctiveness and academic quality of its offerings. The program has been subject to conflicting expectations and demands, e.g., that its courses be the same (in order to fit comfortably into general curriculum and departmental requirements) but be different (to justify their "honors" designation). Further, its mission as a university-wide program requires it to accommodate and respond to the differing priorities of pre-professional schools and a liberal arts college, as codified in their respective requirements.

This proposed plan, put forward by faculty representatives of all five undergraduate schools who serve on the University Honors Program Advisory Committee, attempts to reconcile and respect the goals and prerogatives of all while providing the kind of academic modeling and creativity expected from an honors program. It proposes what is already a compromise between the ideal and the realities of GW's resources, culture and traditions. In turn, the plan asks for openness, compromise, flexibility and close collaboration on the parts of all stakeholders in the interests of the increasingly diverse and extraordinary students who are choosing our University.

## Executive Summary

Implementation of the plan would:

- **Maintain a university-wide Honors Program serving all the undergraduate schools.**
- **Restrict the program to a smaller, more select and self-selected cohort of students, approximately five percent of the undergraduate student body.**
- **Provide for these students a general education “core” through a first and second year required honors course sequence of five four-credit courses year one and four four-credit courses year two.**
- **After year two, require students to qualify for major or “special” honors as currently defined by their major departments.**
- **Sustain and expand the honors “community” for *all* upper division honors students (those who enter as honors students and others who begin in departmental honors) through targeted co-curricular programming, speaker series, social activities, a newsletter and other student publications.**
- **Require all students who wish to graduate as University Honors Scholars (meaning they entered as honors students and have had a four-year honors experience) to earn departmental honors, produce a substantial departmental or alternative honors research paper or project, participate in the Honors Global Issues Practicum and present their capstone work in an honors showcase or other public, community event that recognizes and celebrates “honors”-worthy achievement at GW.**

## Resulting and Related Changes

In addition to the changes apparent in the above, others indirect or implicit should be noted:

\* There would be only one opportunity for admission to the four-year University Honors Program: upon entering GW as a first year student. There would no longer be “internal admissions” for rising sophomores or juniors.

\* University Symposium, honors “contract courses”, “course conversions,” and internships would no longer fulfill Honors Program requirements, although the symposium might continue as a programmatic feature.

\* Students who choose special academic programs with conflicting course or residence requirements would no longer be eligible to participate as well in the Honors

Program. (Note: This circumstance would not exclude BA/MD's or BA/JD's under current policies governing those programs.)

\* The Honors Program would no longer offer any "HONR" language courses (Arabic, ASL, Hindi or Persian.) or honors sections of any departmental, disciplinary or introductory courses, e.g., logic, statistics, chemistry, accounting, acting, comparative and international politics, micro- and macro-economics, sociology, anthropology, creative writing.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Why a University Honors Program?**

Fifteen years ago, the leadership of the University launched the University Honors Program. The purposes of the program then were:

- To help recruit high performing, high scoring students to GW, i.e., make GW more competitive at the high end of the undergraduate "marketplace".
- To engage and challenge, and thereby help to retain, the "best" students.
- To enrich the pool of fellowship applicants and potential winners who could enhance the reputation and status of the university.

The program continues to serve these purposes today. Average SAT scores of incoming honors students are about 100 points above the average for the whole first year class, (. The retention rates of honors students are consistently higher than those of the student body at large. In the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 academic years, honors students, although less than 10 percent of the undergraduate population, have won almost 60 percent of the prestigious national fellowships won by GW undergraduate students. (See **Attachment A**, University Honors Program Fact Sheet, for more information.)

In fact, it could be argued that at this moment, as GW competes for ever more talented students at the higher end of the postsecondary "marketplace" and as the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence moves the community to meet ever higher standards of academic quality, challenge and engagement, the University Honors Program has the potential to play an even more important role in the advancement of the University. Restructured and repositioned as recommended in the following, it could fulfill its promise to do so.

### **GW's Strategic Plan for Excellence**

The University Honors Program can contribute significantly to accomplishment of two goals of the Strategic Plan for Excellence. First, the program can help to "move

*GW solidly into the ranks of the first-tier educational institutions through quality undergraduate education...*” (Goal 1) by enhancing “*challenge, discovery and quality in undergraduate education*” (Objective 1A). The program can contribute by becoming a model for academic engagement, challenge, and creativity, and by requiring of honors students the depth, breadth, and the integration of learning expected of educated leaders in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Second, it can help to “*develop a strong sense of community*” at GW by improving the intellectual environment on campus, by recruiting “*students and faculty who value cultural and intellectual diversity*” and by encouraging the shared “*exploration of new ideas*” (Goal 4).

### **Mission, Goals and Objectives of the University Honors Program**

Informed and inspired by the aforementioned University-wide strategic goals, the renewed mission of the University Honors Program may be articulated as follows:

*“The University Honors Program exists to attract, stimulate and support a diverse, vibrant intellectual community of students and faculty. The program invites students to become active global citizens, to develop a humane perspective on the world, and to sense the wholeness of thought and life that makes for good citizens and moral human beings, pillars of a worthy, decent world community.”*

To these ends, also informed and inspired by the University’s Strategic Plan for Excellence, the goals of the University Honors Program are to:

- Engage and challenge students who are intellectually curious, highly motivated, and love to learn. The program will:
  - ~ Offer a compelling intellectual experience, including intensive immersion in the great traditions of learning, to hone their analytic and expressive powers, deepen their understandings, broaden their perspectives, and spark their passions, curiosity and personal aspirations.
  - ~ Empower students to take the initiative in their educations by cultivating interests across academic disciplines and traditions.
  - ~ Build a coherent and comprehensive four-year honors experience for gifted undergraduate students, a program fully integrated into, synergistic with, and reinforcing of, the highest academic aspirations of the schools and departments.
- Create an honors community hospitable to the more intellectually inclined where students can share the joys of critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and constructive dialogue in close engagement with their peers and dedicated teaching faculty.
  - ~ Provide honors students with a common academic core experience.
  - ~ Strengthen honors residential, academic, and service programming.
  - ~ Regularize faculty participation in co-curricular programming.

~ Promote diversity, celebrate differences and encourage mutual understanding and respect among honors students and faculty.

- In the end, engender a culture of high expectation and accomplishment that will advance undergraduate education throughout the University.

## **BUILDING A COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS**

To accomplish the aforementioned goals and objectives, the University Honors Program must create and support a community of scholars, students intellectually engaged with each other and with faculty mentors, who together are inspired by academic challenge, hard questions and the desire to make a difference in the world.

### **Academic Program**

The University Honors Program is, first and foremost, an academic opportunity offered to enhance the intellectual experiences, meet the highest aspirations, of the University's most intellectually focused and motivated students. It is not a "living and learning community" or a "special program". It should be integral to the missions of all the undergraduate schools, model academic challenge and breed thoughtful, responsible citizens in scholarship and the professions.

Experiences and comparisons, particularly in the fellowships arena, have shown that, as strong as GW's undergraduate programs are, some of our most promising students are not educated to their potentials. At the end of their undergraduate careers, despite superior courses, the best efforts of some of the most dedicated faculty, and their own superior performances as indicated by breathtaking GPA's, these students lack breadth, depth, the inclination to reflect, and the ability and confidence to make original intellectual connections among their studies, their lives and issues in the world. Like other institutions aspiring to go to the next level, GW understands the need to go beyond skill-building, credentialing and pre-profession training to provide a deeper and more coherent undergraduate experience. To do so, the Honors Program proposes instituting a core curriculum in the first two years and an honors capstone, a Global Issues Practicum, in the last.

- **Honors First and Second Year Course Sequence:** Building on the current Honors Proseminar (which explores the ancient roots and evolution of modern thought) , and guided by the shared educational aims reflected in the schools' general curriculum requirements, the Honors Program proposes to develop an honors course sequence to be required of all honors students in their first and second years. (The schools' respective general curriculum requirements may include a certain number of courses in all or some of the following academic categories: literacy; quantitative and logical reasoning; moral reasoning; natural sciences; social and behavioral sciences; creative and performing arts; humanities; cultural and political diversity; foreign languages.)

The sequence would be designed to:

- provide every honors student, regardless of school, with a highly rigorous general education “core”;
- stimulate in students the intellectual breadth, depth and literacy expected of wholly educated persons and leaders in the 21<sup>st</sup> century;
- inform students’ choices of majors and possible interdisciplinary linkages;
- prepare students to engage and excel in upper division honors work;
- develop students’ abilities to integrate and make connections among their various academic learnings, values, life experiences and personal observations.

The courses in detail would be fully developed in collaboration with Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business, the Elliott School of International Affairs, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, and the School of Public Health and Health Services informed by the desired characteristics of an honors course identified in **Attachment B**. However, an outline of a recommended program structure and course and topic sequence is presented at **Attachment C** as a starting point for discussion.

*\* In recognition of their expanded scopes and interdisciplinarity, and the greater academic expectations of students both in and outside of class, honors courses would carry four credits.*

*\* Building on synergies among schools and departments, all honors courses would be multi- and inter-disciplinary in approach, global and cross-cultural in perspective.*

*\* All honors courses would include intensive writing, rhetoric and presentation components.*

*\* The course sequence would be required of all honors students regardless of AP credits. Students’ AP credits would continue to be accepted per university policy but would not serve to fulfill Honors Program requirements. Certain students who could make a compelling academic case might be exempted from the two interdisciplinary science courses in order to engage in more advanced science studies.*

*\* To make the term “global” meaningful, all honors students would be strongly encouraged to take a language at least to the level of respectable literacy and practical competence. However, responsibility for language instruction should rest entirely with the language departments.*

*\* This course sequence would provide the means for all honors students to accomplish the ends of the general curriculum requirements. Certain courses as developed in collaboration with the departments might qualify as prerequisites to courses in a major.*

- **Enhanced Departmental/Upper Division Honors Opportunities:** It is proposed that the third and fourth years of the University Honors Program be integrated with special departmental honors towards the enhancement of both. All Honors Program students would be required to qualify for departmental honors.

Currently, the University Bulletin identifies 30 recognized departmental or special honors opportunities in Columbian College and the Elliott School. (See **Attachment D**.)

The School of Business and School of Engineering and Applied Science and the School of Public Health and Health Services may offer additional opportunities in certain departments for certain of their students. One way now that honors students may complete their Honors Program senior thesis or seminar requirements is by successfully pursuing special honors in their majors. In 2002-2003, 72% (68) did so; in 2003-2004, 78% (153) did so; and, in 2004-2005, 60% (139) did so. Consequently, the impact on the departments of this integration should be minimal, especially given the more selective and smaller Honors Program classes contemplated (about 120 students each).

*\* Criteria for admission to departmental honors would offer the possibility for qualified honors students to enjoy a seamless, integrated, four-year honors experience.*

*\* The community of honors [program] scholars would expand, through collaborative social and co-curricular programming, to include all students engaged in honors work in their third and fourth years, .*

*\* The hope would be that Honors students' proposals for study abroad would undergo rigorous review by the departments to ensure that the programs meet honors academic standards and substantially advance students' academic agendas.*

*\* Particularly where there is not a "critical mass" of honors majors, departments and the Advisory Committee would collaborate on cross-school, cross-disciplinary experiences, seminars, events, projects (service, creative, and otherwise), to enrich upper division honors.*

- **Honors "Capstone" Experiences:** It is proposed that all honors students be required to meet the requirements of departmental honors as well as to participate in an Honors Global Issues Practicum. The practicum would be a cross-disciplinary seminar intended to stimulate integrative thinking, team work and creative projects, and to provide for each student's reflection upon his or her undergraduate experience. In addition, it is proposed that all honors students have the opportunity to present an honors thesis, performance, art work, service project, publication, or other academic "capstone" in a showcase event or series that brings the program, the departments and the schools together in community to celebrate excellence in the University.

## **Community**

The ideal of a "community of scholars" has inspired the program's development over the years and, for some of the most active and engaged students, has been achieved. However, in recent years, the growing size of the program and its marginal role in the overall academic and social experiences of most honors students has compromised its ability to provide a consistent, strong sense of community. The Honors Program should provide a home for the serious and the searchers, the creative and the world-shakers, the political and the a-political, poets, humorists, philosophers, scientists, the reverent and the irreverent, to share their talents and interests with each other in the spirit of inquiry and collegiality. Faculty members should play a full part in this dynamic as instigators, mentors and models. To develop the University Honors Program further as a community of scholars, the Advisory Committee proposes the following.

- Provide a more **intensive common academic experience**. Currently, honors students may take only one course in common, the first year Honors Proseminar. The first and second year honors course sequence recommended above will, in itself, contribute to a stronger sense of community by presenting a common academic challenge.
- **Reduce the size of the program**. With almost 1000 students (about 10% of the undergraduate student body) from five different undergraduate schools and no common academic core, it is virtually impossible to establish a program-wide sense of community. It is recommended, therefore, that the program admit about 5% (120 students) in each incoming class as “University Honors Scholars”.

*\* Ideally, the honors student population would represent 5% of the student population of each school. However, admissions standards should not be compromised in order to accomplish this goal. Admission to the program should remain competitive.*

- Provide a **common living experience** for each class of first year students and continue the existing second year honors residential option. The program currently offers first-year students three choices: the 60-bed honors community in Lafayette; the Mount Vernon Honors Scholars community in Somers Hall; and participation in the general housing pool. Sophomores may choose the 60-bed community in the Dakota at Foggy Bottom. It is recommended that all first year students live together in community at Foggy Bottom. (If a 120-student honors residential community cannot be accommodated at Foggy Bottom, it is recommended, as a second choice, that the current honors residential options be retained and that honors students enjoy the same freedom of choice as non-honors students. With an intensive common academic experience, the need for community-building through common residence becomes less urgent.)
- Continue to provide distinctive **co-curricular community programming**, student-driven, faculty-involving and substantive, for all honors students, including the expanded honors community at the third and fourth year levels. Honors faculty will continue to have responsibility for generating programming related to their courses or scholarly pursuits and geared to the resources of D.C. as much as possible.

### **The Students**

The University Honors Program seeks students who have demonstrated that they have the intellectual curiosity, potential for breadth and depth, appropriate motivation and personal attributes, beyond those indicated by quantitative measures, to benefit from, and contribute to, a community of scholars. Experience has shown that not all high academic performers are necessarily susceptible to the benefits of an honors experience. It is proposed then, that the program become more selective, collaborating with the Office of Admissions and the schools to identify and attract the kind of students desired. Further, again in collaboration with Office of Admissions, the program must intensify efforts to

attract top minority and international students to the program in order to create a diverse as well as talented intellectual community. To these ends, the committee also recommends the following:

- \* Review again the honors admission application form to see if it can be better designed to elicit the desired qualities identified above.*
- \* Move the honors application from the “special programs” section of the GW admissions application and include as a privileged option under each school.*
- \* Consider relating special merit scholarships to participation in the program so that honors students feel recognized and privileged.*
- \* Emphasize in admissions materials the interdisciplinary, cross-cultural emphasis of the program as well as the selectivity.*

### **The Faculty**

In “Basic Characteristics of a Fully Developed Honors Program”, the National Collegiate Honors Council makes two points concerning faculty. They advise institutions to avoid “any tendency to force the program to depend on temporary or spasmodic dedication of particular faculty members or administrators....The program should be fully institutionalized so as to build...a genuine tradition of excellence.” They recommend further, “Faculty participating in the program should be fully identified with the aims of the program. They should be carefully selected on the basis of exceptional teaching skills and the ability to provide intellectual leadership to able students.”

Ideally, the University Honors Program would attract the talents and enthusiasms of the University’s best regular fulltime teaching faculty who could serve the program on a sustained, regularized basis. Under the new structure integrating the program with departmental honors opportunities, this ideal would presumably be realized to a large degree in the third and fourth years. However, as to the first two years, the committee believes that a mixed model would be both realistic and, possibly, best for the program. The recommendations for staffing the Honors Program are, then, as follows.

- Working with the deans and departments, **create ways to attract GW regular full time faculty, senior teaching faculty**, to teach, mentor and otherwise participate for a sustained term in the program (at least two years).
- \* Participation in the Honors Program should be recognized, valued and rewarded as important academic service.*
- \* Teaching in the Honors Program, at any level, should be valued and given equal weight in promotion and tenure decisions.*
- \* Qualified University Professors and emeriti enthusiastic about teaching talented undergraduates should be tapped to teach in the Honors Program.*

- Continue to recruit **full time, jointly appointed contract faculty** to contribute to the teaching of the first and second year sequence.
- \* *Hire contract faculty on indefinitely renewable three-year contracts with 2/2 teaching loads.*
- \* *Continue to provide them with appointments in appropriate academic departments but with less than the full three course, half load obligation.*
- \* *Make clear their primary accountability to the Honors Program.*
- \* *Recognize that their “service” would be primarily to the Honors Program in the form of student mentoring and participation in co-curricular programming.*

Continue to supplement the honors faculty with **adjunct and visiting professors and guest lecturers**. These individuals would be selectively chosen for their expertise and their enthusiasm for working with undergraduates. (An example of the caliber of person sought is current adjunct professor Peter Marks, senior theater critic for the *Washington Post*.)

### **Governance, Coordination and Liaison**

As measured by the standards of the National Collegiate Honors Council, the University Honors Program is not “fully institutionalized.” What this phrase means is that the program is not placed favorably in the administrative or academic structure of the university, that it is not positioned in a way that allows it to best serve students or function in synergy with the schools and departments. To address this core disability, the committee proposes that:

- The Council of Deans assume a leadership role in the evolution and functioning of the Honors Program;
- The Director of the University Honors Program serve as a member of the Council of Deans, in accordance with national standards for honors programs;
- The University Honors Program Advisory Committee serve as advisor to the Council of Deans and the director, representative of the schools, liaison with the schools, and as the body providing general academic oversight and coordination for the program and program development.

The goal is to integrate the Honors Program into the academic mainstream of the University so it may work in effective and credible partnership with all stakeholders. Only then will it be enabled to fulfill its promise to all and contribute to the advancement of the University in the next decade.

## **Funding**

In order to establish a true “tradition of excellence”, the University Honors Program must not only be “fully institutionalized” as proposed above, but must also continue to be funded on a long-term and predictable basis. Funding for the program as redesigned will be achieved through reallocation of current program resources and use of existing advanced academic opportunities. Consistent with the changes recommended above, funds freed by making the program *quantitatively* smaller will be redirected to make it *qualitatively* better. Again, it calls for *no additional funding*.

## **Measuring Outcomes**

Many of the most significant outcomes sought through implementation of this strategic plan are *qualitative* and, thus, in important part, not meaningfully measured by quantitative metrics. The most rigorous and independent assessment of these qualitative outcomes would come from outside the university, e.g., by an outside committee recruited through the National Collegiate Honors Council and through a nationally administered instrument such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment (Rand) that would provide comparative data.

Otherwise, internal assessments of *qualitative* outcomes might include:

- Stakeholder surveys of honors students and faculty, deans, and departments;
- Faculty review of honors students’ “portfolios” developed by students over the course of their participation in the Honors Program and reflecting progress in their intellectual work.
- Requirement of entrance essay on “expectations” and pre-graduation essay on “reflections” in conjunction with the Honors Global Issues Practicum;
- Tracking of academic, professional or service pursuits after graduation.

*Quantitative* measures that might serve as useful indicators of progress or success include:

- Percentage of AR 1’s and 2’s who apply to the Honors Program;
- Percentage of applicants to the program who are accepted;
- Percentage of admitted honors students who come to GW;
- SAT/ACT scores, GPA’s and class ranks of matriculating honors students relative to those of incoming class as a whole;
- Numbers and percentages of minority and international students in the program;
- Retention rates of honors students relative to those of overall undergraduate population;
- Percentage of third-year honors students qualifying for departmental honors;
- Numbers and percentages of honors students doing independent research with faculty;
- Number and proportion of national fellowship applicants, finalists and winners who are honors students;

- Graduation rates of honors students compared to those of the general student population;
- Average GPA of graduating honors students compared to that of graduating class overall.

### **A Beginning**

The plan outlined here is intended to be a beginning not a conclusion. Informed by two years of investigation, study and deliberation on the part of the Advisory Committee and Honors Program staff, these proposals reflect the committee's best judgments, ideas and ideals. They are, however, proposals, recommendations put forward as a starting point for collaboration. At the end of the day, for the program to succeed, deans and departments must invest in it and share in its ownership. The University Honors Program exists to compliment their best efforts and advance their highest aspirations for their students. Their wisdom is essential in ensuring that it does so and is, indeed, a University-wide endeavor.

**ATTACHMENT A*****University Honors Program: Fact Sheet***

Fall 2004

**General**

The University Honors Program serves 965 honors students, almost 10% of undergraduate student body (9,687):

**11% of CCAS [612/5560]**  
**13% of ESIA [268/2015]**  
**9% of SEAS [39/445]**  
**3% of GWSB [46/1471]**  
**5% of SPHHS [9/172]**

**Program Demographics**

58% (562) female  
 42% (403) male

## Home state/country:

40.5% (391) – NY, NJ, PA  
 19.6% (189) – other mid-Atlantic and N.E. states  
 15.9% (153) – “heartland,” mid-western, plains states  
 15.1% (146) – southern, including Virginia  
 8.7% (84) – western states and Hawaii (7.0% from California)

## GW School

63.4% (612) CCAS  
 27.8% (268) ESIA  
 4.8% (46) GWSB  
 4.0% (39) SEAS

**Honors Class of 2008 (#) [variance from program overall]**

197 students  
 54% (106) [-4%] female  
 46% (91) [+4%] male

## Home state/country:

- 35.0% (69) [-5.5%] – NY, NJ, PA
- 21.8% (43) [+2.2%] – “heartland,” mid-western, plains states
- 18.8% (37) [-0.8%] – other mid-Atlantic and NE states
- 12.2% (24) [-2.9%] – southern states (including VA)
- 11.7% (23) [+3%] – western states and Hawaii (7.0% from California)

## GW school:

- 53.3% (105) CCAS [-10.1%]
- 39.6% (78) ESIA [+11.8%]
- 2.5% (5) GWSB [-2.3%]
- 4.6% (9) SEAS [-0.6%]

**Recruitment**

## Honors Class of 2008 (entering class) [variance]:

- Average SAT 1420 (1275) [+145]
  - 730 verbal (640) [+90]
  - 690 math (635) [+55]
- Average ACT 31 (27) [+4]
- Average high school rank 95<sup>th</sup> percentile (65% of undergraduates in 90<sup>th</sup> percentile)

## Honors Program Applications

	2004	2003	2002	2001
Applications:	1203	1405	1494	1150
Admits:	556	599	518	511
Deposits:	153	170	218	147
Yield rate:	27.5%	28.3%	42.1%	28.7%
SAT Avg of Deps:	1415	1400	1390	1380

## Honors Program Invitations

	2004	2003
Invites:	253	339
Deposits:	41	80
Yield rate:	16.2%	23.5%
SAT Avg of Deps:	1425	1450

**Retention**

		Honors (general student population) [difference]		
Entering class:		1998	1999	2000
f-s	96.3 (92.3) [+4]	95.1 (91.5) [+3.6]	94.1 (91.7) [+2.4]	
s-j	94.4 (84.8) [+9.6]	91.0 (84.2) [+6.8]	89.8 (84.7) [+5.1]	
j-s	79.6 (80.9) [-1.3]	77.0 (79.3) [-2.3]	78.8 (79.1) [-0.3] *	
		2001	2002	2003
f-s	94.9 (91.7) [+3.2]	94.8 (92.9) [+1.9]	93.3 (91.8) [+1.5]	
s-j	91.1 (84.1) [+7.0]	90.5 (86.8) [+3.7]		
j-s	71.5 (79.5) [-8.0] *			

**Program Retention**

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
f-s	88.9	95.1	86.4	91.1	94.3	88.8
s-j	86.1	86.9	79.7	87.3	88.6	
j-s*	69.4	66.4	69.5	65.8		

\* change in trend due, at least in part, to high three-year graduation rate

**Graduation Rates**

	1998	1999	2000	2001
3-year	13.9 (2.5) [+11.4]	12.3 (3.2) [+9.1]	10.1 (2.9) [+7.2]	12.7 (3.2) [+9.5]
4-year	85.2 (72.5) [+12.7]	83.6 (71.6) [+12]	83.9 ((69.4) [+14.5]	
5-year	87.0 (78.2) [+8.8]	86.9 (76.5) [+10.4]		
6-year	88.0 (78.7) [+9.3]			

**Fellowships 2003-2004**

- 62% of Rice students (8 of 13) were honors
- 50% of Gamow students (7 of 14)
- 10 of the 17 national fellowship recipients, 59%
- 10 of 14 Rhodes, Marshall and Mitchell endorsees, 71%

## Courses

51 courses offered, including:

- 11 freshmen proseminars
- 36 honors “seminars”
- 4 capstone courses

but not counting:

- Symposium
- 14 independent studies
- 12 internships
- 27 course conversions
- 18 senior theses through contracts and HONR 198
- 8 students enrolled in HONR 196: ESIA Senior Seminar

- Total enrollment: 913
- Enrollment in regular courses (not Symposium, etc): 715
- Average class size: 14
- Total credit hours: 2197

Note: Five Writing in the Disciplines courses were offered in fall 2004, more than any other department, excluding the sections of creative writing offered by the English department.

## Top Ten Majors

- International affairs, 202 (28.1% \*note that this is the default major of ESIA)
- Political science, 47 (6.5%)
- Biology, 45 (6.3%)
- English, 35 (4.9%)
- Psychology, 33 (4.6%)
- History, 26 (3.6%)
- Political Communication, 21 (2.9%)
- Economics, 18 (2.5%)
- Finance, 15 (2.1%)
- Criminal Justice, 11 (1.5%)

**Honors Residential Communities**

171 students in Honors-sponsored housing:  
58 in Lafayette  
33 in Mount Vernon  
16 in Women's Leadership  
64 in sophomore

**Faculty**

17 courses (33%) in fall 04 were taught by full-time GW faculty, including five full-time contract joint appointments

Total faculty teaching in Honors: 38

- Regular full-time GW: 9 (24%)
- Full-time contract joint appointments: 5 (13%)
- Regular part-time: 4 (11%)
- Adjuncts with appointments in other departments: 15 (39 %)
- Temporary: 5 (13%)

**Faculty credentials**

PhD: 27  
JD: 2  
MD: 1  
MA: 4  
MFA: 3  
BA: 1

**ATTACHMENT B****CHARACTERISTICS OF AN HONORS COURSE**

Honors courses should model academic challenge. They should equip and inspire students to dig deeper, climb higher and see farther. An honors course should be characterized by some, if not all, of the following.

**All honors courses should:**

- be distinguishable from a non-honors course;
- be small (cap at 20, sometimes lower);
- offer a discussion-based/seminar format where professors and students engage in dialogue and students bear a high level of responsibility for exploration of ideas and driving discussion;
- encourage and reward independent thinking, risk-taking, originality and creativity;
- move students beyond their comfort zones;
- require broader, deeper, more sophisticated thinking and analysis;
- expect student attendance, preparedness and participation;
- provide faculty who are intellectual models and mentors willing to learn from students;
- be writing intensive *and* provide students with sustained, close, critical evaluations of their writings;
- establish the highest expectations of students, rigorously apply the highest academic standards;
- apply grading policies that fairly recognize, and educate students about, the qualitative differences among truly superior, good, average, below average and unsatisfactory academic work;

**Depending upon the academic discipline, topic and scope covered by the course, an exemplary honors course might also:**

- require a mix of small group and individual work products;
- use a problem-based learning format;
- emphasize primary sources, avoid textbooks;
- include differing cultural perspectives;
- include interdisciplinary perspectives;
- offer learning opportunities outside the classroom, including use of cultural, scientific, governmental, city, social service and international community resources in the Washington, D.C. area;
- be led by professors with specialized knowledge and/or field experience;
- assess students based upon writing and participation, as well as exams.

ATTACHMENT C  
[Updated]

*Proposed “New” Honors Program*

[Honors components in bold.]

<u>Year 1:</u>	Fall	Credits	Spring	Credits
	<b>Humanities Proseminar</b>	(4)	<b>Humanities Proseminar</b>	(4)
	<b>Sciences Proseminar</b>	(4)	<b>Sciences Proseminar</b>	(4)
	<i>University Writing 20</i>	(4)	<b>Quant. Analysis Prosem.</b>	(4)
	_____	(3-4)	_____	(3-4)
	_____?	(1-3)	_____?	(1-3)

Year 2:

<b>Soc/Behav Sci. Proseminar</b>	(4)	<b>Soc/Behav Sci. Proseminar</b>	(4)
<b>Arts/Lit. Proseminar</b>	(4)	<b>Arts/Lit. Proseminar</b>	(4)
_____	(3-4)	_____	(3-4)
_____	(3-4)	_____	(3-4)
_____?	(1-3)	_____?	(1-3)

Years 3-4:

[-----*Current Departmental Honors* -----]

**Honors Capstone: Global Issues Practicum (4)**  
Honors Senior Thesis Option (4) \*

\* If necessary, with departmental approval.

# Graduating With Departmental Honors

(As of Academic Year 2005-06 - see most recent University Bulletin or your Department for more information)

---

## Departments and Requirements

### American Studies

Required Work: Apply for honors candidacy before the end of the junior year, and complete a thesis (AMST 180) with a grade of A; meet special honors requirements state under University Regulations, recommendation from faculty.

### Anthropology, Archaeology, and Biological Anthropology

Required Work: Register for 3 credit hours of ANTH 195, Undergraduate Research, and write a paper of special distinction arising out of a program of directed reading or research.

### Asian Studies

Required Work: Complete either an Elliott School or Honors senior seminar or a senior thesis; students must apply for honors candidacy prior to the beginning of the senior year.

GPA Requirement: 3.4 GPA, overall

### Biological Sciences

Required Work: Approved undergraduate research project under faculty direction.

GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA in the major and 3.0 overall

### Chemistry

Required Work: Undergraduate research (CHEM 195) for at least three credits over two semesters; poster/oral presentation in addition to final report in CHEM 195

GPA Requirement: 3.0 GPA in the major

**Classical and Semitic Languages & Literature**

Required Work: Meet special honors requirements under University Regulations; no later than beginning of the senior year, consult faculty about research project to be prepared under supervision of faculty member; approval of committee and grade of A or A- on research.

GPA Requirement: 3.7 GPA in the major and 3.25 overall by end of junior year.

**Communication**

Required Work: Meet the requirements for selection to *Lambda Pi Eta*, The National Communication Association Honor Society, receive a grade of A on the thesis required in COMM 199, Senior Seminar.

GPA Requirement: 3.3 GPA in the major and 3.0 overall

**Earth and Environmental Services**

Required Work: Submit approved honors thesis, recommendation from department, EES 199 2 or more credits.

GPA Requirement: 3.3 GPA overall

**Economics**

Required Work: Submit an Honors paper to the department.

GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA in the major

**English**

Required Work: Apply to the program in writing by October 15 of the junior year; take ENGL 195 in spring of junior year followed by ENGL 196 in the fall; ENGL 194 or 198 spring of senior year and earn an A on the Honors Thesis.

GPA Requirement: 3.4 GPA in the major and 3.0 overall; 3.25 in the major and 3.0 overall to initially apply

**Fine Arts and Art History**

Required Work: By the beginning of senior year, students should consult their advisor regarding eligibility and selection of an area of study and a director of the research or creative arts project.

GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA in the major and 3.0 overall by end of junior year.

### **German & Slavic Languages and Literatures**

- Required Work: Apply for honors candidacy by the end of first semester, junior year; must attain Advanced Level speaking proficiency; and must successfully complete an honors thesis (GER or SLAV 197-198)
- GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA in the major and 3.0 overall

### **History**

- Required Work: Apply for Honors and complete HIST 199 junior year; in the following semester, earn an A or A- in HIST 191 (based on work done in HIST 199).
- GPA Requirement: 3.0 GPA in the major

### **International Affairs**

- Required Work: Complete either Elliott School or Honors senior seminar or Honors senior thesis or a major independent study research project approved by the program director.  
Students must apply for candidacy prior to the start of the senior year.
- GPA Requirement: 3.4 GPA overall

20

### **Journalism**

- Required Work: Consult with program director at the start of the senior year, application must be made by (October 15 or March 15) of graduation semester and include letter of application and a portfolio of published or broadcast work.
- GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA in the major and 3.5 overall

### **Latin American Studies**

- Required Work: Complete either Elliott School or Honors senior seminar, or an Honors senior thesis or a major independent study research project approved by the program director; apply for candidacy prior to start of senior year.
- GPA Requirement: 3.4 GPA overall

### **Liberal Arts**

- Required Work: Earn an A in at least six of the 12 required 100-level liberal arts courses.
- GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA, overall

### **Mathematics**

- Required Work: Enroll in 3 credit hours of MATH 195 in addition to the 27 credit hours of required courses in the major, present an oral defense of a senior thesis prepared for MATH 195.
- GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA in the major

**Middle Eastern Studies**

Required Work: Complete an Elliott School/ Honors senior seminar, or an Honors thesis, or a major independent study research project approved by the program director; major must declare candidacy prior to the beginning of the senior year.

GPA Requirement: 3.4 GPA overall

**Music**

Required Work: Apply by the end of junior year and complete an approved independent project under faculty supervision for at least 3 credits.

GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA in the major, 3.0 overall

**Philosophy**

Required Work: Submit an honors paper that must be approved by committee of 3 faculty members.

GPA Requirements: 3.7 GPA in the major, and 3.25 overall

**Physics**

Required Work: Submit an honors thesis based on a two-semester research project.

GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA in the major and 3.0 overall

**Political Communication**

Required Work: Apply in the beginning of senior year; complete PCM 196 and SMPA 199 senior year; present an oral defense of a research paper before a committee.

GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA in the major and 3.5 overall

**Political Science**

Required Work: Meet requirements for special honors under University Regulations; apply in writing by third week of the semester preceding final semester of study; take PSC 101 or 104 prior to taking PSC 192, and enroll in PSC 192 at least one semester before graduation, in which the student completes an independent research project for Honors after faculty approval.

GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA in the major

**Psychology**

Required Work: Apply before senior year; submit application before senior year; PSYC 197 or 200 level seminar; take a Psychology Independent Study (191 or 198) with distinction.

GPA Requirement: 3.5 GPA in the major

**Religion**

Required Work: REL 191 no later than first semester, senior year.  
 GPA Requirement: 3.4 GPA in the major

*Romance Language and Literature*

Required Work: Consult major advisor or proseminar professor at start of senior year.  
 GPA Requirement: 3.75 GPA in the major, 3.0 overall

**Sociology / Criminal Justice / Human Services**

Required Work: Take SOC 195 or HMSR 193 by fall of senior year and complete a senior honors thesis.  
 GPA Requirement: 3.3 GPA in the major

## Statistics

Check with department.

**Theatre and Dance**

Required Work: Consult with faculty advisor at the start of the second semester of junior year; complete TRDA 199 with a grade of A.  
 GPA Requirement: 3.4 GPA in the major