

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

August 30, 2007

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, September 7, 2007, at 2:30 p.m. in the State Room, 1957 E Street, N.W., 7th Floor.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of May 11, 2007 as distributed
3. Resolutions
 - (a) A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN WITH REGARD TO THE COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY SENATE (07/2); Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (The Resolution is attached)
 - (b) A RESOLUTION ON ESTABLISHING A STEERING COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM REVIEW (07/3); Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (The Resolution is attached)
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. Response of the Administration to Senate Resolutions for the 2006-07 Session (Administration's Response and Resolutions are attached)
6. General Business
 - (a) Nominations for election to Senate Standing Committees: Fiscal Planning and Budgeting: Professor Robert C. Waters; Research: Professor Sharon F. Lambert
 - (b) Nominations for election to the Steering Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum Review (nominees to be announced)
 - (c) Report of the Executive Committee
 - (d) Annual Reports of Senate Standing Committees
 - (e) Tributes to retiring faculty
7. Brief Statement (and Questions)
8. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

Attachments

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN WITH REGARD TO THE COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY SENATE (07/2)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan currently allocates a single seat in the Faculty Senate and on the Senate's Executive Committee to the School of Public Health and Health Services; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan, under Article II, Section 5, subsection (a), currently establishes a three-year consecutive term limit on membership on the Senate's Executive Committee; and

WHEREAS, limiting the School of Public Health and Health Services to a single seat on the Faculty Senate and on the Senate's Executive Committee may come into conflict with the above term limit, NOW, THEREFORE

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

(1) That Article III, Section 2, subsection (a) (3) of the Faculty Organization Plan be amended to read:

“The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, nine; the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, School of Engineering and Applied Science, School of Business, School of Medicine and Health Sciences, and the Law School, three each; the Elliott School of International Affairs and the School of Public Health and Health Services, two each.”

(2) That the President, as Chair of the Faculty Assembly, is requested to place on the agenda of the Faculty Assembly at its meeting on September 10, 2007 the proposed amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan; and

(3) That, upon approval by the Faculty Assembly, the President is requested to forward at the earliest opportunity the proposed amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan to the Board of Trustees for final approval, to become effective by January 1, 2008.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
August 24, 2007

**A RESOLUTION ON ESTABLISHING A STEERING COMMITTEE ON
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM REVIEW (07/3)**

WHEREAS, During the 2006-2007 academic year the Faculty Senate and School faculties engaged in considerable discussion of the report of the Joint Administration/Faculty Task Force and its recommendation of the adoption of a 4x4 undergraduate curriculum “scenario;” and

WHEREAS, After reviewing a report and recommendations of a Special Committee of the Faculty Senate, which evaluated the Joint Task Force Report, the Faculty Senate adopted Resolution 06/5 on March 9, 2007, which recommended that the faculties of the several Schools should be given “a reasonable opportunity to undertake a comprehensive review of their respective curricula” prior to any decision by the University to adopt the 4x4 “scenario;” and

WHEREAS, Resolution 06/5 further stated that “the Faculty Senate urges the faculties of the several Schools, beginning in the Fall of 2007, to undertake a comprehensive curriculum review in their Schools, in collaboration with the incoming administration of President-elect Steven Knapp;” and

WHEREAS, Resolutions passed by School faculties were basically consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of Faculty Senate Resolution 06/5; and

WHEREAS, President Knapp has expressed the Administration’s support of a comprehensive review of the undergraduate curriculum and its accomplishment as a collaborative effort of the Deans, their faculties and the Faculty Senate; NOW, THEREFORE,

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

That the Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of a Steering Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum Review, which should undertake a comprehensive review and evaluation of the University’s undergraduate curriculum and, based on that review, should issue recommendations for revisions to that curriculum consistent with the University’s stated aspirations for academic excellence, and

That the Steering Committee should consist of:

- 1. Five Deans (Columbian College, the Elliott School of International Affairs, the School of Business, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, and the School of Public Health and Health Services), one of whom should serve as Committee Co-Chair, and**
- 2. Five faculty members, nominated by the Executive Committee for election by the Faculty Senate, one of whom to be designated as Committee Co-Chair, and**
- 3. Five faculty members, one from each of the foregoing Schools, elected by the faculty of the school and appointed by the Dean of the respective School.**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That the Steering Committee should work in concert with each of the standing or specially established School Committees undertaking the comprehensive review of its School curriculum.

**Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
August 24, 2007**

RESOLUTIONS 2006-07 SESSION

Resolution Number	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Action	Response of the Administration
06/1	5-12-06	A Resolution to Support Student Representation on the Board of Trustees	Defeated	Acknowledged.
06/2	11-10-06	A Resolution to Amend the <u>Bylaws</u> of the Faculty Senate	Adopted	Enthusiastically received.
06/3	11-10-06	A Resolution on the Timetable for Action on the recommendations of the Joint Administration/Faculty Task Force on a possible four-Course, Four-Credit Undergraduate Curricular Structure	Adopted	Overtaken by events.
06/4	12/8/06	A Resolution on Construction of New Academic Facilities	Adopted as twice amended	Will inform administrative thinking; it is not seen as binding.
06/5	2-16-07	Substitute Resolution Regarding Recommendations in the Report of the Joint Administration/Faculty Task Force on a Possible Four-Course, Four-Credit Undergraduate Curricular Structure	Adopted as amended (including Appendix A)	Not appropriate for administrative comment.

RESOLUTIONS 2006-07 SESSION

Resolution Number	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Action	Response of the Administration
06/6	3/9/07	A Resolution on Library Endowment Funds	Adopted as amended	Noted with encouragement to the faculty to help rise additional funds for the library
07/1	5/11/07	A Resolution of Appreciation	Adopted	The sentiments are received with Gratitude and reciprocated in Kind.

A RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES (06/1)

WHEREAS the Board of Trustees of The George Washington University is ultimately responsible for all University policy, and students are directly affected by policies set by the Board of Trustees

WHEREAS the University Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities explicitly endorses student involvement in the governance of the university, in that

- a) Article I (C) states that “the student body shall have clearly defined means, including membership on appropriate committees and administrative bodies, to participate in the formulation and application of the institutional policy affecting student affairs,” and
- b) Article V (A) emphasizes the intent to “encourage the inclusion of students as active participants in the formulation” of University-wide regulations; and

WHEREAS a 1970 Task Force appointed by the Trustees Commission on Student Governance recommended "fuller representation of student participation in academic policy making" and "more effective arrangements for bringing the thinking of students to the Board of Trustees"; and

WHEREAS the solutions that have been introduced—to appoint a recent Alum to the Board, or to invite students occasionally to speak to various Trustee Committees —do not succeed in providing full representation of student participation or in effectively bringing student thinking to the Board; and

WHEREAS students serve as Trustees in many private and public universities—including schools such as Duke, Tufts, the University of Miami and others that GWU considers its market-basket competitors; and

WHEREAS the current student body has demonstrated their high level of support for a Student on the Board through a Spring 2005 Student Association referendum and a November 2005 referendum, **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

That the faculty senate supports the creation of voting seats on the Board of Trustees of The George Washington University specifically for students enrolled in degree-granting programs of the University.

**Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
April 1, 2006**

Defeated, May 12, 2006

RATIONALE and HISTORY

The Inadequacies of the Current Representation

Alumni Representation. In the 1970s, the Trustees voted to include a recent alum to the Board to address concerns that the Trustees might not understand the concerns and perspectives of the student population. However, this change has not adequately addressed the problem because alumni are too removed from the daily life of the student body. While recent alums can provide insight into issues that were relevant during their experiences at GW, recent alums have little knowledge of current problems, concerns, or student perspectives. It is more appropriate and effective to have student perspectives offered from those who are immersed in current student life and are aware of the concerns of the current student body.

Student Presentations to Board: Students are invited to present to select Trustees Committees to provide a student perspective on issues where the Trustees consider such insights necessary. While students are certainly grateful for the opportunity to present, this format does not allow students to participate fully, and therefore cannot fully inform the Trustees of student concerns and perspectives. Furthermore, because the student presenters do not have a vote in policy decisions, this arrangement does not address the 1970s Trustee's Task Force concerns for "fuller representation of student participation in academic policy making."

Student President Participation. Currently, the Student President has the option to attend meetings but must serve as an observer, and therefore cannot participate in the development of policies and regulations for the University.

Student Support

Student support for a Student Trustee is currently high, and such support has a long history at the University.

- Spring 1973 Marvin Center Governing Board referendum "*Should the students have voting members on the Board of Trustees?*" 88.01% voted in the affirmative.
- Fall 2004-13 [Corr] Student Association Senate Resolution "*A Resolution to Support Student Representation on the Board of Trustees*" was passed on October 12, 2004 and signed by the Student Association President on October 18, 2004.
- Spring 2005 Student Association referendum "*Should the President of the Student Association be authorized to appoint voting Student Association Representatives to the University Board of Trustees?*" had a 71.86% vote in the affirmative.
- Fall 2004-35 [Henchman] Student Association Senate Resolution "*A Resolution to Reaffirm Support for Student Membership on the Board of Trustees, and related purposes*" was passed on November 9, 2005 by unanimous consent and signed by the Student Association President on November 12, 2005.

Student Trustees at Comparable Universities

Student Trustees are appointed to Boards of Trustees at a variety of American universities, and their experiences provide evidence that such arrangements are beneficial to the Universities. Student Trustees serve at (among others) Duke University, Southern Methodist University, Tufts University, University of Miami, Howard University, Cornell University, Brandeis University, and the University of California system. These universities employ a range of methods for appointing the Trustees, and designate their roles and responsibilities differently.

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE (06/2)

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

WHEREAS, Section 10 was amended by Faculty Senate Resolution 04/8 to delete a reference to the former Standing Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has determined that there is a continuing need for a Standing Committee whose stated mission will include responsibility for issues involving academic and administrative support for the faculty;

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee has concluded that such issues should be included within the stated mission of the Committee on Faculty Development and Support, and has therefore recommended that the name of that Committee should be revised to reflect its expanded responsibility; NOW, THEREFORE

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

That Section 10 of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate be amended by replacing “Faculty Development and Support” with the following: “Faculty Development, Including Academic and Administrative Support.”

**Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
October 27, 2006**

Adopted November 10, 2006

**A RESOLUTION ON THE TIMETABLE FOR ACTION ON THE
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JOINT ADMINISTRATION/FACULTY TASK
FORCE ON A POSSIBLE FOUR-COURSE, FOUR-CREDIT
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULAR STRUCTURE (06/3)**

WHEREAS, The George Washington University Administration established a joint Administration/Faculty Task Force (the Task Force) under the leadership of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs in April 2005 to examine the feasibility of introducing a four-course, four-credit undergraduate curricular structure and,

WHEREAS, the Task Force, after eighteen months of deliberations, produced and circulated a report on October 24, 2006 together with appendices covering minutes of Task Force meetings, visits to other universities/colleges - trip reports, summary of trip reports, models for the possible reduction of general education requirements, preliminary models of expense-reduction scenarios in converting from a 5x3 to a 4x4 curricular structure, goals and scenarios and,

WHEREAS, the Faculty Code of The George Washington University specifically grants the regular, active-status faculty an active role in the development, revision, or elimination of curricular offerings of each department and school and,

WHEREAS, the Administration accepted Resolution (05/5) adopted by the Faculty Senate, at its meeting on January 20, 2006 that the final report from the Task Force be submitted concurrently to the School Faculties and the Faculty Senate for full review, debate, and subsequent recommendations and,

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate established a Special Committee of the Faculty Senate to receive and evaluate the report of the Task Force and to make comments and recommendations to the Faculty Senate and,

WHEREAS, on receipt of the Report on October 24, 2006, the Special Committee was convened on October 30, 2006 and arrived at an estimate of its responsibilities to assess the Task Force report together with relevant materials and documents available to it and not included in the Task Force Report and,

WHEREAS, implementation of a 4x4 curriculum would significantly change the organization and operation of the University's educational activities and would require the expenditure of enormous faculty resources for the next several years, and

WHEREAS, the Special Committee, in the light of previous status reports from the faculty representatives (as reported at the Faculty Senate meeting of April 14, 2006 and summarized in the minutes thereof), determined that the recommendations of the Task Force report would require additional inquiry and thorough deliberation by the Faculty Senate and by the Faculty members throughout the University through their School's Faculty meetings and committees, and

WHEREAS, such inquiry and deliberation could not be accomplished within a two-month timetable, and

WHEREAS, the Schools and the Faculty Senate must have sufficient time to comment on the Task Force Report and to make their recommendations in line with their responsibilities regarding any changes to the curriculum, **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

That the Senate Special Committee and aforementioned School Faculties make their recommendations no later than one week before the Faculty Senate meeting of April 13, 2007.

Special Committee on the Proposed 4x4 Curriculum Report
November 7, 2006

Adopted November 10, 2006

A RESOLUTION ON CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ACADEMIC FACILITIES (06/4)

WHEREAS, investment in new academic facilities and programming is an investment in the future of students and faculty advancing the Institution's Strategic Goals for Academic Excellence, enhancing connections to external partners, improving the Institution's ability to compete with peer institutions, attracting benefactors, and expanding the endowment, and;

WHEREAS, the Administration recognizes the opportunities created by investment in new academic facilities and, consistent with this recognition, has identified four schools (SEAS, SPHHS, GSEHD, Law) and two centers (Science, Cancer) in need of new/expanded academic space, and;

WHEREAS, the approval of a new campus plan is pending and a Science Center¹ was identified earlier by the faculty as the top priority for investment among future academic projects (Senate Resolution 04/1), it is timely for the faculty to prioritize the programmatic needs for new facilities among the identified Schools and Cancer Center, and;

WHEREAS, the operations of the Institution in the main University and in the Medical Center are budgeted separately, it is appropriate to prioritize separately the need of each for new academic facilities, and;

WHEREAS, the Physical Facilities Committee of the Faculty Senate, charged with studying the programmatic needs of the identified Schools and Cancer Center, has completed this study and concluded that the magnitude of need is greatest in SEAS, followed by SPHHS and GSEHD with no decisive differences between the latter two, and that need in the Law School and Cancer Center is comparatively lesser, and;

WHEREAS, The Council of Deans and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate have reviewed both the data available to and the conclusions reached by the Physical Facilities Committee and have expressed confidence in these conclusions, **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

That solely on the basis of programmatic needs:

1. ~~That~~ The Faculty Senate endorses investment in new facilities for SEAS as the priority second to a Science Center among future academic construction projects on the University side of the Institution, and;
2. That GSEHD assumes the priority second to a Science Center among future academic construction projects on the University side of the Institution if SEAS is accommodated in the Science Center as planned, and;

¹ present working name is Science and Engineering Complex

3. That SPHHS is the top priority among future academic construction projects on the Medical Center side of the Institution, and;
4. That existing, single use academic space that becomes available as programs transition into the new Science Center will be offered temporarily to GSEHD and SPHHS while these Schools await new facilities, and;-
- ~~5. That the emphasis of advancement activities for new academic construction on the University side of the Institution should be in support of the Science Center, SEAS, and GSEHD and that the emphasis of advancement activities for new academic facilities on the Medical Center side of the Institution should be in support of the SPHHS.~~

Physical Facilities Committee
November 27, 2006

Adopted as twice amended, December 8, 2006

**SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE
REPORT OF THE JOINT ADMINISTRATION/FACULTY TASK FORCE ON A
POSSIBLE FOUR-COURSE, FOUR-CREDIT UNDERGRADUATE
CURRICULAR STRUCTURE (06/5)**

WHEREAS, The George Washington University established a joint administration/faculty Task Force (the Task Force) under the leadership of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs in April 2005 to examine once again the desirability and feasibility of introducing a four-course, four-credit undergraduate curricular structure, and

WHEREAS, The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, in accordance with the Faculty Code, established a Special Committee of the Faculty Senate to receive and evaluate the report of the Task Force and to make comments and recommendations to the Faculty Senate, and

WHEREAS, the report of the Special Committee is attached hereto as Appendix A, and

WHEREAS, The faculty is committed to a comprehensive review and improvement of curriculum, and

WHEREAS, Resolution (03/4) adopted by the Faculty Senate concluded that a 4X4 curriculum would greatly diminish the opportunities for breadth and number of required and elective courses students could take, and

WHEREAS, The Task Force claimed that the proposed 4X4 curricular structure would facilitate academic excellence but did not provide persuasive evidence to support that claim, and

WHEREAS, Transition to a 4x4 curriculum would significantly disrupt the operation of the University's educational activities and would require the expenditure of enormous faculty resources for the next several years, and

WHEREAS, The Special Committee believes that a major curricular review should be undertaken, beginning in the fall of 2007, as a collaborative effort between the faculty and the incoming administration of President-elect Steven Knapp, and

WHEREAS, Exit surveys of graduating seniors have been cited as primary evidence of poor intellectual challenge and intellectual engagement, but such surveys are generally regarded as producing results of limited validity and recent surveys have actually revealed a modest improving trend under the University's existing curriculum, and

WHEREAS, Recent tabulations of undergraduate student course evaluations indicate students find that current courses are difficult and do provide a “great deal of significant high quality learning,” and

WHEREAS, The Task Force report assumes that students who are not currently challenged will have their learning increased with decreased “seat time” and that substantial cost savings will result from the implementation of a 4X4 curriculum, and

WHEREAS, The academic literature shows that increased learning and favorable educational outcomes increase with higher amounts of “seat time,” and accordingly, educational outcomes could not reasonably be expected to improve under a 4X4 curriculum that reduces the number of required classroom hours per semester, and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate therefore believes that the Task Force’s proposed 4X4 “scenario,” which could lead to a potential reduction of up to 20% in the amount of required classroom hours per semester, is not consistent with the University’s stated aspirations for academic excellence, and

WHEREAS, Models presented in the Task Force report used to predict cost savings are simplistic and rely on unrealistic expectations, while reasonable alternative assumptions lead to predictions that costs could actually increase under a 4X4 curriculum, unless a 4X4 curriculum is simply used to inflate academic credit hours by reducing required classroom hours and faculty positions; NOW, THEREFORE,

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

That the Faculty Senate recommends to the faculties of the Schools that the 4X4 curriculum model “scenario” as described in the report of the Task Force should not be adopted at this time, because that “scenario” has not been adequately justified and would prematurely commit the University to a curricular model with major potential flaws, before the faculties of the several Schools have been given a reasonable opportunity to undertake a comprehensive review of their respective curricula and to determine the desirability of fundamental changes to those curricula, and

That the Faculty Senate urges the faculties of the several Schools, beginning in the Fall of 2007, to undertake a comprehensive curriculum review in their Schools in collaboration with the incoming administration of President-elect Steven Knapp, and to establish metrics informed by

scholarly literature on the learning process that are reasonably designed to achieve the University's stated aspirations for academic excellence.

**Special Committee on the 4X4 Curriculum Report
February 16, 2007**

Adopted, as amended, February 16, 2007

APPENDIX A

**The George Washington University
Faculty Senate
Special Committee on the Joint Administration/Faculty Task Force on 4x4
Curriculum Structure Report**

Report to the Faculty Senate

February 16, 2007

The Special Committee has had three meetings this semester as follows: January 30, February 6 and February 13.

The subcommittees as previously reported in the interim report of the Committee presented their findings at the first of these two meetings. A resolution from the Committee for the Faculty Senate was prepared at the third. In brief, the presentations of the subcommittees follows:

Subcommittee I: Academic Motivation for Change to a 4*4 Curriculum.

The premise that a change in curriculum to the 4x 4 will increase the student perception of their level of academic challenge/engagement remains unproven. In 2003 the conclusion of a Study Group appointed by the President to study the risks and opportunities of moving from a 5 course to a 4 course semester are as valid in 2007 as in 2003 when the Academic Issues Subcommittee of the Study Group stated there is “little if any empirical research on the connection between a 4x4 or 3x5 and academic engagement, and it is therefore unclear whether a 4x4 system would be a solution to the problems it is meant to solve”. (The report of the Educational Policy Committee and the resolution 03/4 of the Faculty Senate are in line with this). The only significant additional piece of data collected by the GW Task Force in the recent study is a comparison of opinions from faculty and others from schools with a 4x4 or some permutation thereof and the original premise is not borne out.

The Report of the Academic Excellence Strategic Committee in 2002 expressed concern over lack of academic challenge and over the low proportion of student time spent studying. This Committee made many suggestions for change that might reverse their concerns. Among these were changes that spanned recruiting/admissions, orientation, changes that could be made in the freshman, middle, and senior years as well as changes in faculty and campus culture and changes in the existing curriculum that fall short of converting to a 4x4. All of these suggestions have merit and would probably be easier and less costly to implement than a total curricular change. This Committee recommended the establishment of an Academic Excellence Oversight Committee to Oversee and assess the changes recommended by the Committee. This does not appear to have been carried out.

Exit surveys of graduating seniors have been cited as a primary evidence of poor intellectual challenge and intellectual engagement. In 2002 the question about academic challenge was added to the survey and in 2005 the question about intellectual engagement was added (a short track record). These scores are revealing a modest improvement in trend (no statistical evaluation given) over this time. In 2003, 2004, and 2006, respectively, 57%, 62%, and 66% of the sample responded that intellectual challenge was high/somewhat high in the major and in 2004 and 2006, 30% and 33% of the sample responded that intellectual challenge was high/somewhat high in the introductory courses. Similarly, in 2006, 77% of the sample responded that the level of engagement in the major was somewhat/very high and 46% responded that the level of engagement was somewhat/very high in the introductory courses. While these values are lower than desirable, it is interesting to note that over this same time period, 85-86% of the sample is satisfied with the quality of their education, 82-89% is satisfied with GW, and 80-88% of the sample is satisfied with the courses in their major while 69-74% of the sample is satisfied with the introductory courses. To the extent that the survey data is relied upon to stimulate curricular change, one might conclude that the larger problem lies with the introductory courses and that these should be given some attention.

If there was indisputable evidence that a change to a 4x4 curriculum would lead to a significant financial saving that would go into academics without the curricular change detracting in the least from the academic experience, this would be a valid reason, in our opinion, to undertake the curricular change. Such evidence does not seem to exist. It would seem that a study within the Schools of their existing curriculum and how it might be improved is very much in order.

Subcommittee II: Specific Issues Related to 4x4 Implementation.

The Joint Administration Task Force (4x4 Task Force) identified several issues that the Committee investigated: accreditation, transfer students, double majors, 5 year undergraduate programs, study abroad programs, impact on graduate programs and seat time.

The accreditation issue does not appear to present difficulties to all programs. For example, it has been reported that it does in the GW Law School but it does not for GSEHD. A member of the Board of Examiners for NCATE did mention that it was unusual in graduate programs; he had not seen a 4x4 in any visits he had made on behalf of NCATE.

Transfer students all must have their transcripts reviewed and the admissions personnel in each college must then translate all courses into credits to fit the proposed new curricular structure. This is more complicated when translated by semester into a different format. It is time consuming as it cannot be uniformly done, but must be reviewed by personnel individually. This would be labor intensive.

Students with double majors present a significant concern for the proposed new curricular structure. Course requirements would need review and revision. It would present a new set of challenges and would require greater clarity about the impact beyond what the Committee could find. However, study abroad programs do not appear to have as many implications other than the obvious one - semesters are easier to arrange students programs and travel within the traditional structure. Additional data is needed to respond to this issue. This would include the needs of international students as well. No adequate study of the implication of the 4X4 on international students with regard to their needs, their attendance patterns and expectations has been carried out.

Contact hours, referred to as “seat time” is also a major concern. Current scheduling practices are already creating “seat time” challenges. The new time bands used by GW to alleviate the classroom space issues have already reduced the class contact hours. However, the principal concerns expressed by faculty were marketing and recruitment, particularly for graduate programs. The compressed time frame would significantly impact the recruitment process.

Report of Subcommittee III: Financial Motivation for Change to a 4x4 Curriculum

The Joint Administration Task Force (4x4 Task Force) Report claims that switching from the current 5x3 to a 4x4 curriculum structure would reduce instructional costs significantly. Scenarios evaluated in Appendix D of the 4x4 Task Force Report forecast cost savings ranging from 5 to 15 million dollars per year. These forecasts are produced by the assumption that 350 fewer courses/sections would be offered saving both labor and classroom rental costs. We note that among the “market basket schools” that GW is usually compared with, only 4 of the 15 schools have “some kind” of a 4x4 curriculum structure. Some of the others have already considered and rejected adopting a 4x4 curriculum.

Understanding the Basis for Forecasting of Cost Savings

The forecast of cost savings is based on a forecast of a 20% reduction in classroom teaching time per student, from 12.5 hours per week to 10 hours per week with no change in class size. This would necessitate a 20% reduction in the requirements for graduation from the current 40 courses to 32 courses. With no change in the number of courses taught by each faculty member, cost savings would arise due to a smaller wage bill for faculty and some reduction in classroom rental costs. (The 4x4 Task Force Report claims, without proof, that this reduction in classroom time would have a positive effect on student learning. This contention stands in contrast with literature on educational outcomes where there is evidence of a significant positive product of classroom time.¹ Furthermore, the 4x4 Task Force Report forecasts ignore the fact that, at some universities the 4x4 provides the same or even more than the 12.5 hours of classroom time as is currently provided in the 5x3) It appears that the 4x4 Task Force failed to produce a forecast of cost savings that would accompany a shift from 5x3 to the type of 4x4 in which classroom teaching time would not be reduced. Our expectation is that there would be no cost savings in this case.

Accordingly, our brief examination of the economics indicates that switching to a 4x4 with no reduction in classroom time (call this a 4x4-12.5 classroom hours) would result in a significant cost increase. The arguments supporting this position will be apparent upon reading the remainder of this report. Therefore, the only question remaining is the forecasts of cost savings for changing from a 5x3-12.5 to a 4x4-10.0 – i.e. for the case in which classroom time is decreased by 20%. (No attempt will be made to compensate for the fall in educational output associated with a 20% decline in classroom time.)

¹ See for example, Robert A. Fitzgerald, “College Quality and the Earnings of Recent College Graduates,” National Center for Educational Statistics, Research and Development Report, August, 2000. Also note that American Bar Association standards for accreditation include requirements for seat time per credit hour. See also the summary of effects on school performance generally in Erid Hanushek, “Assessing the Effects of School Resources on Student Performance: An Update,” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Summer 1997.

Important Factors Not Considered in the Forecast of Cost Savings

The forecast of cost savings offered by the 4x4 Task Force Report omits a number of factors that could alter the conclusions substantially. A number of the most obvious of these omissions are enumerated below. Given the short time provided for the Committee's work, this list should not be regarded as complete.

1. The most significant cost savings to be realized for a 4x4 implementation is in the reduction of full-time active status faculty needs. Indeed, if a 20% reduction in full-time faculty is made to correspond to the 20% reduction in course offerings, a substantial savings will be realized. On the other hand if the 20% reduction in faculty needs comes from a reduction in the vast number of part-time faculty the University employs – described as a desirable objective - there will be a cost increase because of the larger percentage of full-time faculty needed to staff the surviving courses. This decision is critical to understanding and estimating the financial impact of a 4x4 implementation.

2. The 4x4 Task Force Report notes that implementation costs associated with transforming a 5x3 into a 4x4 would be significant. Given that these costs would be experienced “up front” they could be more consequential than any future cost savings. Indeed, the “bottom line” effect of the switch should be based on discounting the early transition costs and any future cost savings to a present value.

3. The 4x4 Task Force Report forecast is based on the assumption that, under a 5x3 each student takes 5 courses per semester and under a 4x4 each student takes 4 courses per semester. However, students are far more likely and able to depart from the standard of 4 courses under a 4x4 than under a 5x3 curriculum. Indeed, if anything, the 5x3 invites students to take fewer courses per semester while the 4x4 encourages students to take more than 4 courses per semester. If students responded to the 4x4 by taking an extra course, it would become a 5x4 and the number of total courses taken by students will not be reduced much. Under these circumstances the forecasted cost savings would fall substantially.

4. If students adjust course loads as noted above, and the requirement for graduation is 32 courses, and additional course credit can result from advanced placement or summer sessions, many students may routinely graduate in 6 or 7 semesters rather than 8 as is now the norm. In addition to obvious effects on the “class tradition” associated with the 8 semester norm, this will impose significant additional costs due to the cost of recruiting new students to fill enrollment.

5. The 4x4 Task Force Report focuses on engagement of students and expenditure per student as problems – the former to be increased and the latter decreased. Based on an informal analysis of higher education, we suspect that educational engagement of students and expenditure per pupil are positively related! The 4x4 Task Force Report never considers the possibility that the low level of instructional expenditure per student at GW is the impediment to greater student learning and satisfaction! We believe that a comparative analysis of instructional expenditures per pupil at GW and market basket schools would confirm the hypothesis that GW expenditures are currently too low rather than too high. Accordingly, we

recommend that, going forward, a comparative cost analysis of GW and market basket schools be performed on cost data which separates expenditure by instructional expense (i.e. faculty salaries by full time-part time), educational support, libraries, academic plant, general and administrative, categories so that future planning can focus on cost savings in areas where current expenditures per pupil are inconsistent with the competition.

Conclusions

Based on the above considerations, we conclude that switching from a 5x3 to a 4x4 with reduced classroom time could result in either net cost savings, no significant change in net costs, or net cost increases for the institution depending on implementation decisions and the relative effects of the items noted above and not considered in the 4x4 Task Force Report. Given that the effect on learning from a reduction in classroom time is considered to be negative by most faculty (note that this proposal is not suggested for the School of Law because accreditation there is based on the assumption that learning is positively related to classroom time), it is curious that there is any support for such a change.

Respectfully submitted, Robert J. Harrington

Members of the Committee: Professors Abravanel, Biles, Cherian, Gallo, Kahn, Tickin, West, Yezer & Harrington (Chair)

A RESOLUTION ON LIBRARY ENDOWMENT FUNDS (06/6)

- 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 is significantly lower for collections than is funding for library collections at most institutions in the University's market basket.
- Whereas, surveys of faculty and students have consistently shown dissatisfaction with the depth and breadth of the collection of the Gelman Library; 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, in consultation with the Committees on Libraries and Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, provide the Faculty Senate, for its consideration and response, a plan through which, by gradual increases in the library collection budget beginning in FY 2008, and without jeopardy to other GLS needs, the collection budget will reach a level equal to the average level of materials expenditures in GW’s market basket group within a time frame commensurate with the University’s “first-tier” aspirations;and
2. That the University Administration raise to “University-level” status its fundraising efforts for The Gelman Library System in order to meet Goal 5 of the *Strategic Plan* (strengthening GW’s infrastructure) as well as Resolving Clause Number 1 of this resolution (gradually increasing the library collection budget).

Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries
Professor Alan G. Wade, Chair
February 5, 2007

Adopted as amended, March 9, 2007

A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION (07/1)

WHEREAS, Stephen Joel Trachtenberg has served for nineteen years as President of The George Washington University with imagination and energy during a period of significant growth and transformation for the University, including the construction of new residence halls and academic buildings, a redesign of the Foggy Bottom campus, acquisition of the Mount Vernon campus, and further development of the Virginia Campus, and

WHEREAS, he has announced that he is leaving this position in July 2007 to become a member of the faculty, and

**WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees of The George Washington University, in recognition of his achievements, has appointed him University Professor of Public Service;
NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

That the Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation to Stephen Joel Trachtenberg for his many years of service to The George Washington University and his efforts to promote a wider recognition of the University's accomplishments throughout the nation and the world, and welcomes him as a faculty colleague.

**_____/s/_____
Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
May 11, 2007**

SEAL

Adopted May 11, 2007