

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

REGULAR FACULTY ASSEMBLY
October 16, 2006
Jack B. Morton Auditorium

CALL TO ORDER

The Assembly was called to order by President Trachtenberg at 3:03 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting held on October 31, 2005, were approved as distributed.

PRESENTATION OF THE BENDER TEACHING AWARDS

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman advised the Assembly that the Bender Teaching Awards, endowed by friend of the University Morton Bender, recognize teaching excellence at GW. Recipients receive a \$500 prize to be used for travel to a professional meeting, the purchase of equipment, or some other activity related to faculty development. The recipients are selected by a committee of faculty each spring semester based on letters of support from students and faculty, student teaching evaluations, and examples of teaching materials and completed student work. Vice President Lehman then introduced this year's recipients, each of whom received a Bender Teaching Award in the indicated category. The text of the faculty citations also appears below.

Joseph Dymond
Geography
Award Category: Part-time Teaching

Joseph Dymond has been teaching in the Department of Geography at the George Washington University since the fall of 2002. He received a Master of Science in Recreation and Park Science with a minor in Geography from the Pennsylvania State University in 1994 and a Master of Natural Science in Geography with a minor in Environmental Studies from the Louisiana State University in 1999.

One of Professor Dymond's departmental colleagues writes that, in his three years at GW, he "has taught several undergraduate courses (and) has also been proactive in reviving Geography's Summer Field Research ...He has the special gift of relating concepts and theory to practice and the real world. Through relevant case studies and examples, he makes abstract ideas such as transnationalism, nationality and cultural identity come alive for the students...His lively lectures, laced with his self-deprecating wit, are supported by stunning visuals and memorable examples...he is able to generate animated debates even in

classes with 80-100 students...Many of our current undergraduate majors credit Joe with introducing them to the discipline and converting them into enthusiastic geographers.”

Another is similarly enthusiastic, writing that “(Joe) does not shy away from controversial topics, and yet has an ability to encourage the presentation of different viewpoints and get students engaged in the discussion...it is a combination of his strength of character, his humility and his commitment to education that make his classroom a model for what the college experience should be.”

Professor Dymond is clearly well-liked by his students. As one student writes, “It is a testament to Professor Dymond’s fairness and engaging teaching style that students give such glowing reviews.” Another writes, “I have never been simultaneously challenged, comfortable and motivated like I was in Professor Dymond’s classes, in my four years of college...Unfortunately, I ran out of classes I could take with Professor Dymond! But I have continued with my Geography minor and still find myself in his office, sharing stories and asking him about what new and exciting things are happening in his classes.”

A student evaluation comment strikes at the heart of what students take home from Professor Dymond’s classes: “I find myself reading the ‘World News’ section of the paper every day.”

Balaji Hebbar
Religion

Award Category: General Teaching

Balaji Hebbar received his B.A. in Religion in 1977 and his M.A. in Hinduism in 1980 from the George Washington University. In 2000, he completed his Ph.D. in Religion at the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands. He has been teaching at the George Washington University since 1997 in the Religion Department and the Honors Program.

Of Professor Hebbar’s dedication to his teaching, a colleague writes, “Balaji has taught as an adjunct professor in the Religion Department for nine full years and has usually offered two or three courses a semester...His courses cover a bewildering variety of subjects: Introduction to Eastern Religion, Indian Philosophy, Hinduism, Buddhism, South Asian Buddhist Thought, Doctrine and Debate in World Religions, Religions of the East, Great Minds of the East, Minor Religions of India, and Zoroastrianism...(student) praise for Balaji usually focuses on the following issues: First, he has a remarkable ability to relay difficult concepts in Eastern religion in terms that everyone can understand. Second, he is incredibly knowledgeable about his subject and works very hard to impart that knowledge to his students. Third, he is an extremely challenging teacher in the quality and quantity of readings he assigns and in his essay assignment and exams.”

A student wrote that “Professor Hebbar requires his students to visit different temples, mosques, and churches to get a more hands-on approach to learning about the religion. I think it is a dynamic educational method that helps textbook material become more tangible for the students.”

Another student writes, “What has truly impressed me is that, while Eastern Religions remain a primary focus of his research and teaching, Professor Hebbbar has an amazing understanding of the wider historical picture: of how various cultures from different regions of the world (not simply of the East) have influenced one another, and how these linkages have had transformative effects.”

One student evaluation in particular seemed to encapsulate Professor Hebbbar’s qualities as an excellent and demanding teacher. When asked to comment on the course, the student wrote one phrase: “Hardest class ever.” When then asked to comment on Professor Hebbbar as an instructor, the same student wrote just as succinctly, “Brilliant. Loved him.”

Kirk Larsen

History & International Affairs

Award Category: Innovative Use of Technology

Kirk Larsen is the Korea Foundation Associate Professor of History and International Affairs and also serves as the Director of the Undergraduate Program in International Affairs. Professor Larsen received his Ph.D. in history from Harvard University. Prior to coming to the George Washington University in 2000, he taught in the Asian Studies Department at the University of Texas at Austin. He teaches courses in Korean history and culture, modern Korean history, and the history of international systems. He is currently continuing his research on Sino-Korean economic and business relations during the so-called Open Port Period in Korea from 1876-1910. His current research intersects with the study of imperialism in Asia, of networks, patterns, and trends of trade in Northeast Asia, and of the Overseas Chinese in Korea.

A faculty colleague writes of Professor Larsen’s History 250 (History and International Systems) offering, “the course and readings looked fascinating, and I would have liked to take it myself, a comment I have also heard from colleagues who visited Kirk’s classes as peer evaluators.” Another colleague writes that “he is a lively lecturer but also handles discussion adroitly. His personal warmth and attentiveness to his students enhance his popularity with them, yet he is firmly committed to setting high personal standards as well.”

In a peer evaluation, yet another colleague writes, “It is not so much that he knows a lot, it is that he is capable of hitting the essentials and synthesizing complex issues...I cannot underline too much how excellent this historian is in throwing out nuggets of strictly pertinent information.”

Students echo these observations as well in their evaluations, writing that Professor Larsen is “one of the best professors I have had at GW without a doubt. (He is) very helpful whenever I needed further direction, and his enthusiasm for his subject is contagious.”

Another student comment states that he “has a very creative, interactive, and engaging way of lecturing, with the backing of a great deal of knowledge on the subject.” Another writes,

“There is nothing I would change here. I have nothing but praise for Dr. Larsen and thought that this was the perfect way to start off my career at the Elliott School.”

Yaron Peleg

Classical & Semitic Languages & Literatures

Award Category: Full-Time, Non-Tenured Teaching

Yaron Peleg grew up in Israel and completed his B.S. in film and television studies at Emerson College and worked in the film and television industry in the U.S. and in Israel. Professor Peleg studied for his Ph.D. in Hebrew literature at Brandeis University and at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He taught Hebrew language, literature and culture courses at Brandeis University and a course on Israeli film at Princeton University. He joined the faculty of the George Washington University in 2002, where he is the coordinator of the Hebrew Program and teaches courses in Hebrew language and literature and contemporary Israeli culture.

A peer observer writes, “(Professor Peleg) conducted the class skillfully and at a high intellectual level, engaging the students in a sophisticated discussion of primary and secondary literary sources and encouraging broad class participation...He demonstrates consummate professionalism and real talent as a teacher in courses conducted in English while also insuring quality Hebrew instruction throughout the Hebrew program by training and supervising the full- and part-time Hebrew faculty.”

Another colleague writes, “When reading Yaron’s syllabus, I have always been pleasantly surprised and duly impressed. The selections were those of new and older authors, rarely the same ones from semester to semester, yet always thought provoking and meaningful. Poetry or prose, segments of film, and material on the internet are always selected because they have the potential to touch the students, stimulate their thought processes, evoke their reactions, and provide a worthwhile learning experience...perhaps the ultimate proof of Yaron’s fine teaching is the fact that his students rise willingly to his high expectations.”

Professor Peleg’s student evaluations are similarly enthusiastic. One student wrote, “I learned more about literary analysis in this class from Yaron than I did in any English class I’ve ever taken.” Another student writes, “You can see (Yaron’s) satisfaction when a student “gets” a concept, and his elation when the student is able to run with it.” This same student commented on Professor Peleg’s expansive vocabulary: “A common joke among students is that we’ll often write *English* words he uses in the margin to look up when we get home from class.”

Yet another student writes, “I use the word ‘teacher’ instead of ‘professor’ because there are many professors, though distinguished in their field through writing and research, who do not have the love of their material and the ability to connect with students; both traits required of a great teacher. Dr. Peleg is truly a great teacher.”

Jean-Claude Zenklusen
Chemistry

Award Category: Innovative Use of Technology

Jean-Claude Zenklusen was born in Switzerland and moves as a child to South America. He received his M.S. in Biochemistry from the University of Buenos Aires in 1990 and his Ph.D. in Cancer Biology & Genetics from the University of Texas, Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, in 1995. At present, he is the Senior Staff Scientist at the Neuro-Oncology Branch of the National Cancer Institute. He joined the Department of Chemistry at the George Washington University as an Assistant Professor (Lecturer) in 2001.

In a letter of recommendation to the selection committee, a colleague writes the following of Professor Zenklusen's work with Professor Martín Zysmilich on the Chemistry 3 & 4 program: "Professor Zenklusen has done an extraordinary job teaching these classes, with enrollments maintained at the very highest level and enthusiasm and engagement high." This colleague goes on to note that "lectures are enhanced with audio and video clips as well as web-based materials and other graphical format items. They are updated regularly. The result is extraordinary, capturing the interest of the students, enhancing the lectures and leading to improvements in course engagement...Professor Zenklusen also stays closely connected using email, so that in spite of his full-time position as a Researcher at the National Cancer Institute, he maintains regular dialog with his students."

Another colleague writes that "Jean-Claude doesn't 'need' to teach. Jean-Claude teaches because he truly enjoys and loves doing it, and that exudes in all his classes."

A myriad of positive student comments accompanied Professor Zenklusen's nomination materials, and this comment sums them up very well: "He was a wonderful professor. I have never had a better science instructor. I was constantly impressed with the amount of basic knowledge I gained in each class. I thoroughly enjoyed his teaching style, experiences, and how he infused them into the class. Science has never been my favorite subject, but this class has definitely made me reconsider my original stance on science because of his teaching."

INTRODUCTION OF NEW FACULTY

Vice President Lehman welcomed faculty members new to the University, As is customary, Vice President Lehman asked those present to step forward to a microphone in the front of the auditorium to introduce themselves to the Assembly. He also requested that each give their name, appointment, and say a few words about their interest in teaching, scholarship, or research at the University.

REMARKS BY THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Lilien F. Robinson congratulated the recipients of the Bender Teaching Awards and welcomed new faculty to the University. On behalf of the Executive

Committee, Professor Robinson presented her report to the Assembly. (The Report is enclosed)

REMARKS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Vice President Lehman presented his remarks to the Faculty Assembly; those remarks are attached.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

President Trachtenberg presented his remarks to the Faculty Assembly; those remarks are attached.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Assembly, President Trachtenberg adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m. after inviting everyone to the reception in the Brady Gallery.

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Secretary

REPORT TO THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY
Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
October 16, 2006

I would like to extend a warm welcome to members of the Faculty Assembly as we begin a new academic year. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I offer the following report on the Senate's recent activities.

RESOLUTIONS

During the 2005-2006 session the Faculty Senate considered six resolutions. Four were adopted without emendation; two were adopted as amended. The administration accepted four of the resolutions; recommended additional study for one resolution and, as required by the *Faculty Code*, transmitted one of the resolutions for approval by the Board of Trustees. The latter approved it on October 13, 2006.

Proposed by Standing Committees of the Senate, these resolutions addressed significant topics of concern to the University community. I would like to focus on a number of them, which I believe you will find important and timely.

“A Resolution to Endorse the George Washington University Statement of Ethical Principles”

Pursuant to the Board of Trustees' indication that they wanted the University to adopt a statement of ethical principles and at the request of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, a draft statement was prepared by the Office of General Counsel. The draft was reviewed by the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom and forwarded with modifications to the Faculty Senate, which approved it. As indicated in the resolution, the Faculty Senate's understanding is that the primary purpose of the Statement is to summarize the University's aspirational guidelines, rather than to provide an independent basis for imposing sanctions or modifying policies and procedures already in place.

“A Resolution on Procedure with Respect to the Deliberation and Decision on the 4x4 Proposed Curriculum”

Introduced by the Executive Committee, this resolution confirms the Faculty Senate's understanding of the process that will be followed with respect to the report of the Special Task Force on the 4x4 curriculum. The resolution provides for the concurrent transmission of the report to School faculties and the Faculty Senate for review, debate, and recommendation.

“A Resolution Establishing Criteria for Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotion of Regular Active-Status Faculty Serving in Non-Tenure-Accruing Appointments”

This resolution, presented by the Committee on Appointment, Salary, Promotion Policies and the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, was in response to the Executive Committee’s request that they examine issues pertaining to non-tenure accruing faculty. It provides for a category of special service faculty who would be appointed in order to fulfill special teaching, program administration, or development needs. It also sets forth criteria and procedures for appointment, reappointment, and promotion of regular, active- status faculty serving in non-tenure accruing positions. Because this resolution calls for changes to Article 1B and Article IV, A.5 of the *Faculty Code*, it required approval by the Board of Trustees, which it has received.

“A Resolution Regarding the University Budget for FY 07”

This resolution, introduced by the Executive Committee, addresses the anticipated budget gap between revenues and expenses of 8.2 million for FY ‘07 and provides options for closing the gap without reduction in support for academic programs. It proposes reductions in expenditures in administrative offices reporting to the Executive Vice President and Treasurer and the Office of Student and Academic support services, as well as reduction in projected transfer of funds from current revenues to capital spending and debt service.

“A Resolution on Library Endowment Funding”

Introduced by the Committee on Libraries, this resolution addresses funding of the Gelman Library system. It calls for the establishment of a five-year plan for gradual increases in the Library collections budget in order to make the Gelman Library system competitive with peer institutions and to assist in the University’s achievement of its strategic goal of moving into the first tier of educational institutions. The resolution further requests that the Administration make the Gelman system a high priority in its fund raising.

In its response to this resolution, the administration advised that further study was required. Accordingly, the Executive Committee had transmitted that recommendation to the Committee on Libraries.

SPECIAL FEBRUARY 3, 2006 MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Prompted by faculty concerns with respect to the projected budget shortfalls and with the agreement of the Faculty Senate, the Executive Committee arranged for a special Senate meeting on the University FY 2007 Budget. At the February 3, 2006 meeting Vice Presidents Lehman, Katz,

and Chernak provided presentations followed by questions and discussion of the current FY 2007 budget assumptions, projected shortfalls and their impact on academic and administrative operations, and ways of closing an anticipated gap between revenues and expenditures in the FY 2007 preliminary budget estimates.

REPORTS

The Faculty Senate received thirteen reports on a wide range of subjects, including: classroom renovations, class scheduling and availability of classrooms, FY05-06 and FY'07 budget assumptions, faculty salary and equity, composition of the faculty with respect to tenured/tenure accruing and non-tenure or tenure accruing status, Square 54 (old hospital site) development and campus construction, and emergency preparedness. The Senate also received periodic updates on the work of the special task force on the possible 4x4 curriculum from Vice President Lehman as well as a report by the Senate's representatives on that task force.

In addition, the Faculty Senate continued a process, instituted in 2001-2002 session, of presentation of school status reports by the Deans. During the 2005-2006 session the Senate received an update on the Graduate School of Education and Human Development from Dean Futrell.

STATUS OF PERSONNEL MATTERS

Grievances

There are currently two grievances, one in the School of Business and one in the Columbian College in the hearing process. The case in the School of Business is in hearing, while the case in Columbian College is in appeal. One School of Business grievance was settled during the 2005-06 session.

Nonconcurrences

An administration nonconcurrency with a faculty tenure and promotion recommendation in the Business School was forwarded to the Executive Committee for review and recommendation.

The Executive Committee recommended that the administration withdraw its nonconcurrency. The nonconcurrency was withdrawn by the administration and the faculty member granted tenure by the Board of Trustees and promotion by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

CURRENT MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION

I would like to call your attention to two matters currently under consideration by the Faculty Senate.

Resolution of the Board of Trustees

At its May 2006 meeting the Board of Trustees passed a resolution requesting a review of the University's tenure and promotion process and the role of school-wide personnel committees. Pursuant to that request the Executive Committee has transmitted the resolution to the Committees on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies and Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, requesting that they form a joint subcommittee to consider the matter. The latter has now been appointed.

Special Faculty Senate Committee on the Proposed 4x4 Curriculum

In anticipation of the distribution of the 4x4 Task Force Report and its potentially broad ranging academic implications, the Executive Committee has appointed a special committee, representing diverse disciplines, to review the document and make its recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Senate considered and dealt with matters that are important to the University's welfare and crucial to the success of the faculty's role in the governance of the University, as established in the *Faculty Code*, which speaks to our responsibilities and our individual and collective rights. Dedicated to the protection of those rights, the Faculty Senate is the primary vehicle of expression and action.

Supported by the provisions of the *Faculty Code*, and because of the dedicated work of generations of faculty colleagues, the Faculty Senate has achieved a long and remarkable record of success. On behalf of our colleagues on the Faculty Senate, I would like to thank you for your past contributions and urge you to continue your involvement through membership on the Senate and its committees. Your participation and support are essential.

University Faculty Assembly

16 October 2006

3:00 to 5:00 PM

Media and Public Affairs Building

805 21st Street, NW

in

The Jack B. Morton Auditorium

Remarks by

Donald R. Lehman

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

and

George Gamow Professor of Theoretical Physics

Academic Challenge:

What does it mean for faculty members and students?

Welcome

Good Afternoon!

It is always a great privilege to offer remarks at our annual University Faculty Assembly. I like to start by conveying that I hope you had a productive summer, whether you were doing teaching, research and scholarship, or taking some time off to recharge your “batteries.” Summers for me these days seem little different than the normal academic year. It actually seems that each succeeding year becomes more filled with important things that must be done. On reflection, I don’t believe that feeling is simply perception, but a reality of the growing complexity of what we must do to have a major research university operating effectively both internally and externally. Certainly, I think most of us would agree that the external requirements and expectations being imposed on us by the federal government and accrediting agencies are an added burden. Nevertheless, I did find time this summer to go away and do some reading and sailing, which always seems to recharge my own “batteries.”

Introduction

Today, on the eve of the release of the *Report of the GW Task Force on a Four-Course, Four-Credit Undergraduate Curricular Structure* (we expect to be able to release the report later this week), I thought it would be valuable for me to give you an overview of the Report’s content. You might ask, then, why I entitled these remarks “Academic Challenge – What does it mean for faculty members and students?” I chose this title because the driving “force” behind the discussions about a 4x4 curricular structure focused on intellectual engagement and academic challenge for GW’s undergraduate students.

Before I get into speaking about the content of the Report itself, I believe it would be worthwhile for me to elaborate on what is meant by “intellectual engagement” and “academic challenge.” Intellectual engagement and academic engagement are for our purposes essentially synonymous. Intellect normally refers to an individual’s ability to learn and reason or to think abstractly or profoundly. Academic, in this context, normally is a reference to studies or scholarly performance based on higher learning. Engagement associated with these words implies that one is actively committed to the higher learning needed to enhance scholarly performance along with the ability to think abstractly as opposed to concretely. Academic “challenge” on the other hand has to do with how the learning environment is structured with regard to expectations – it refers to testing an individual’s abilities. Challenge, used in this way, is not commonly thought to mean more work. Rather, it is a measure of the difficulty or complexity of the materials being understood or the problems being solved as well as the rigor and discipline required to achieve understanding or a solution. For example, think of the *Sudoku* puzzles in the daily newspaper. On Mondays, they are relatively easy to solve, but by Friday they can be especially challenging. And, for those who really want a challenge, there is the *Samurai Sudoku* in the Sunday comics of the *Washington Post* newspaper, which brings added complexity through overlapping basic *Sudoku* puzzles.

The University's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence contains an important goal with respect to undergraduate education: "Move GW solidly into the ranks of the first-tier educational institutions through quality undergraduate education..." The aim at the undergraduate level is to "enhance student engagement and learning through academic challenge and a rigorous intellectual environment that permeates every aspect of student life." There is no doubt that many of GW's students come with high expectations for academic challenge. This is good! Whether they fully understand what this means in practice is another matter. As Nannerl Keohane, former President of Duke University said in a speech concerning Liberal Arts education, "Students, and their parents, should understand that a high degree of intellectual engagement and a willingness to live through periods of intellectual austerity, difficulty, and challenge are essential to a successful education and its promise for greater personal and professional reward later in life."

Charge to the Task Force

In March 2005, I put together the Task Force on a 4x4 Undergraduate Curriculum. The Task Force had a membership of 26 people of whom, one was a dean, two were associate deans, fifteen were regular faculty members, five were staff, and three were students. The Task Force met for the first time in late April 2005 and had its last meeting on 6 October 2006. All together, the Task Force met approximately 25 times over the period of its work.

In my charge to the Task Force, I indicated that my goal was to have a group of faculty members and others work with me on an in-depth analysis of the possibility of shifting GW from a 5x3 to a 4x4 undergraduate curricular structure. I referenced a report that was prepared by a subcommittee of the "Academic Excellence Strategic Planning Committee" entitled "Enhancing the Intellectual Engagement of GW Undergraduate Students." This particular report is the one that introduced the concept of the University Writing Program and other initiatives that have since been implemented. In addition, this report recommends that the University "continue to explore alternative curriculum models, such as the four-credit, four-course per semester model (4x4 model), with the aim of increasing the academic challenge and depth of material covered within courses." While I was motivated first and foremost by the academic aspects of exploring a new curricular model, I was simultaneously well aware of and appreciative of President Trachtenberg's consistent message over a number of years that a 4x4 curriculum structure can bring financial savings for the University. His message is not to be ignored if we want to realize a number of our aspirations in The Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, many of which require additional monetary resources. Overall, I sought a thorough, in-depth analysis, including those associated with costs and savings, associated with the potential adoption of a 4x4 curricular structure.

Work of the Task Force

After several brain-storming sessions, the members of the Task Force agreed that the issues to be considered fell under four broad categories: Communication/Culture,

Academic, Administrative, and Resources. Simultaneously, it was agreed that trips to other universities and colleges with 4x4 curricular structures would be worthwhile. What I want to do today is give you a brief summary of some of the key points made under each of the broad categories and the reports of the trips.

Communication/Culture:

“There was a general consensus within the membership of the Task Force that a successful transition to a 4x4 curricular structure at GW would require a cultural change toward a more academically focused GW. The change would need to occur among faculty members, students, and administrators although the extent and nature of the change may vary by person, department, and school. The strategic focus on academic excellence and increasingly higher faculty and student expectations can be considered the start of a cultural shift toward a more academically focused GW.

“If there is to be change, the perception among faculty members that the change is another unfunded mandate must be overcome. There must be incentives for faculty members and departments to commit themselves to the changes needed to achieve the stated, overall objective.”

These main points are underpinned by discussions that focused on faculty workloads, the motivation for such change, and the cultural aspects associated with students. With regard to students, the question of whether our students would be willing to embrace greater rigor was foremost. There was concern expressed that current student recruitment strategies seem to overemphasize GW’s location as a selling point. There was discussion about whether adding depth and complexity to assignments would lead to students becoming academically engaged. It was suggested that students will become more engaged if the standards for high grades are raised.

Academic:

Academic issues were discussed under six main headings: impacts on faculties, impacts on curricula, impacts on special academic programs, impacts on students, impacts on graduate programs, and alternative strategies.

“A great amount of the discussion concerning impacts on faculties focused on workload and class sizes. The most striking outcome of the discussions was that the faculty members of the Task Force did not agree on credit hours equaling seat hours. Few, if any, remarks were made about the nature of advising, perhaps reflecting the decreasing role of full-time faculty members in the advising of students or a sense that advising responsibilities do not change based on a curricular model. Issues associated with course modifications were discussed extensively but more so in connection with the curricular discussions.”

“Extensive discussion took place on the issue of curricula both in the general sense and with respect to a change in the curricular structure. This discussion appears to reflect a

sense within the Task Force that it is time to do a major review and revision of the undergraduate curricula at GW. There appeared to be a consensus that consideration of the 4x4 curricula structure is a strong motivator to undertake such a review.”

“Only one program was considered under (the special programs) heading – the University Honors Program. The focus of the presentation and following discussion was the newly developed strategic plan for the University Honors Program. The essence of the presentation and discussion are summarized in the single paragraph given below:

- University Honors Program (UHP) Director Grae Baxter and UHP Advisory Committee Chair Leslie Jacobson provided an overview of the proposed strategic plan for the program that includes the development of required four credit UHP courses as part of the first and second year curriculum. Whether or not the four credit courses would involve additional classroom time has not yet been determined, and it is anticipated that such decisions may be discipline specific. Four credit courses in the UHP are intended to facilitate achievement of the desired learning outcomes. It was suggested that the curricular structure proposed by the UHP could be used as a model for improving the educational experience for a larger percentage of students.”

“Though the work of the Task Force was focused primarily on undergraduate programs, some discussion took place with respect to a four-credit course structure in graduate education. These discussions were driven by the existence of five-year bachelor’s/master’s programs and the general issue of the undergraduate-graduate interface. The former involve an overlap year where students are simultaneously enrolled in undergraduate and graduate courses and the latter where some GW undergraduates enroll in graduate courses in their senior year. In addition, for pragmatic reasons, it is appropriate to consider graduate courses if a conversion to a 4x4 undergraduate curricular structure is made.”

“There was certainly a sense by more than a few of the Task Force members that, in principle, increased academic rigor can be accomplished without changing to a 4x4 curricular model. Students who want to be serious about academic life can be serious in the existing environment. Nevertheless, there was a sense that addressing the needed cultural change to develop the environment of more academic challenge for our students requires us to rethink our curricula and how we actually recruit our students. Consideration of the 4x4 curricular model offers a comparative structure in which to explore changes for the purpose of enhancing student engagement in academic life.”

Administrative:

Similarly to the “Academic” issues discussions, the administrative discussions were covered under four headings: connected to faculty members, connected to students, connected to administrators, connected to GW staff in general. Some of the flavor of these discussions is as follows:

“The 4x4 can be viewed as one potential consequence of plans to address the larger issues of defining GW’s identity, assessing the optimal use of available resources, defining learning objectives, and reviewing the curriculum. There is evidence that the larger issues can be addressed within the current curricular model, but it may be that the 4x4 would better facilitate desired change. Faculty involvement in addressing budget and other matters can be initiated as it was for the purpose of studying the 4x4 model. The deans are engaged in addressing the larger issues, but not all deans involve the faculties in that process. If saving money is a goal of the 4x4, the faculty will be interested to know who will no longer be teaching and how the money saved would be reallocated.”

“The outcome of more student time spent on coursework would require a university-wide understanding of the purpose of such a change, a willingness on the part of faculty to increase course rigor, and a willingness on the part of students to accept the challenges and time commitment associated with greater academic rigor. It is not clear that current students, who have the expectation of time available for internships and work, would be willing to shift the balance toward more time spent on coursework.”

Resources:

The discussions with respect to resources focused on general topics like expense savings, teaching costs, infrastructure costs, education/training of faculty members, and the cost of such a transition. A sense of these discussions follows:

“The scenario of keeping teaching loads the same and adding an hour of teaching time was discussed. Regardless of current teaching loads and the current willingness on the part of some faculty now to offer more than 2.5 hours per week of teaching time per three-credit hour class, it was suggested that the faculty would not accept a mandate to do more work for the same compensation. The faculty would demand incentives, and the department chairs would need to ensure that the intended changes to courses were implemented. The changes may include an increase in classroom time, or may add depth using a variety of assignments and modes of delivery.”

Three Preliminary models of Expense-Reduction Scenarios in converting from a 5x3 to 4x4 Curricular Structure were developed by a subcommittee of the Task Force. The flavor of that work follows:

“The three scenarios are constructed on the basis of the distribution of reduced sections across the three classes of teaching faculty members: Tenured/Tenure-accruing, Non-tenure-accruing, and Part-time. Respectively, the three scenarios are defined as reductions among the three classes as follows: Scenario 1 -- 0, 20, and 80%; Scenario 2 – 30, 30, and 40%; Scenario 3 – 50, 50, and 0%. The key assumptions have to do with the size of the undergraduate population, the decrease in enrollments, the average section size, and the reduction in the number of sections per semester. Input information has to do with the current percentage of undergraduate

sections taught by the faculty members in each appointment class per semester and the average cost per section. The respective scenarios lead to savings of approximately \$4.85M, \$10.1M, and \$14.8M per academic year when savings of approximately \$1M on classroom space rental is included in each. Most likely, somewhere between \$5M and \$10M in savings can be expected from this component alone. These numbers can be larger when account is taken for reduced administrative work (central offices) and if graduate offerings are converted to the four-credit course model.”

Trip reports:

Time during a Task Force meeting was devoted to a discussion of what was learned from the visits to other universities. The schools visited were Boston University, Tufts, and Northeastern in Boston, NYU in New York, Penn and Swarthmore in Philadelphia, and Duke in Durham. Georgetown University was visited as well though they do not have a 4x4 curricular structure at this time. The discussion made clear that the differences among the schools are such that not all lessons learned apply to all schools that were visited, nor can all the lessons necessarily be successfully applied to GW. The findings and inferences are as follows:

Findings --

- There is no “pure” 4x4.
- A 4x4 curriculum does not have to be uniform across all schools within the university.
- The benefits of changing to a 4x4 would not be immediate.
- With sufficient preparation and stakeholder involvement, the university can redefine itself in ways that would make it worthwhile to devote significant time and other resources to the effort.
- Faculty buy-in is critical to success.
- GW needs to define what it wants its identity to be before it can successfully implement changes that are consistent with its identity.
- Changing attitudes/culture is key to successful curricular change.
- Transition costs can be high.
- The trend toward measuring learning outcomes should be a focus of any change.
- Pedagogies linked to a focus on inquiry-based learning and learning outcomes demand more time spent by students outside of the classroom, and that would be easier to achieve with one fewer course each semester.

Inferences --

- Changes in course structure must be connected to curricular change for significant change to occur.
- Internships are too great a focus at GW.
- Many GW students have to work and need the time to work jobs off campus where they can earn the most money.

- GW's marketing efforts focus on the city, and the city is both a problem and a benefit in terms of student learning.
- With one fewer course each semester, GW students may perceive that they have more time to devote to internships (unless each course requires more time).
- Unlike students at Penn and Swarthmore where academic activity on campus appears to be the gauge of success, GW students perceive activities outside of the classroom (i.e. internships, etc.) as the route to success.

Conclusion – Final Goal and Scenario

In an effort to help clarify goals and definitions after months of discussion, members of the Task Force completed an assignment that would lead to a vote on the final recommendations. The assignment was for each member of the Task Force to articulate in the form of a goal what it is the Task Force is trying to achieve from an academic standpoint by reconsidering the possible switch to a 4x4 curricular structure. Examples of academic goals include increasing academic challenge, increasing student engagement, adding rigor to the curriculum, and improving learning outcomes. Following the statement of the goal, each member was asked to offer a definition of exactly what is meant by the stated goal in an operational sense. Following the definition of the academic goal, the assignment was to provide two or three scenarios for achieving that goal.

A summary of the assignment input was discussed at a subsequent meeting, and votes were taken to narrow the goals and scenarios under consideration. Based on the vote and further discussion, a refined goal and two scenarios were drafted for additional review before a final vote was taken.

The primary difference between the final two scenarios considered by the Task Force was that one scenario recommended the transition to a 4x4 curricular model and the other scenario recommended addressing the goal of increasing academic excellence within the existing 5x3 structure.

In a final vote taken with two Task Force members absent, the following goal and scenario were approved.

The 4x4 Committee ratified by a vote of 20-1 our overall "Goal" statement:

Goal: At the undergraduate level, GW intends to increase student engagement and learning through academic challenge and a rigorous intellectual environment that permeates all aspects of student life [See GW's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence]. This goal can best be realized through a fundamental cultural change that has its foundation in committed faculty members and curricula (general education requirements as well as within the major) that challenge all students in all courses through active course participation, reading, research, writing, critical thinking, analyzing, and collaborating. We believe that a rigorous intellectual environment should treat

all students as adults who are required to think independently, come to their own conclusions, and communicate their thoughts and conclusions precisely to others.

The 4x4 Committee adopted the following “Scenario” by a vote of 13-8 as their recommendation for achieving the above goal:

Scenario: To enhance learning and retention through rigorous, in-depth examination and application of knowledge by reducing the number of courses taken each semester, a 4x4 or 32-course curriculum model will be implemented. Conversion to this model will require faculty members in all academic units to revise curricula and carefully construct outcomes and valid assessment methods at the university, school, and department levels.

It is clear that we must not go to a 4x4 structure without a simultaneous commitment by the faculties and administration to serious curricular changes. The discussion of the changed curriculum must go to the faculties before any transition to 4x4 is enacted. Though 4x4 makes sense coupled with curricular change, it would be a useless and expensive nuisance without such change.

We see reconfiguring of the general education requirements as a critical first step so that first- and second-year students will have some common courses or, at any rate, courses that are in conversation with each other. Not only do we envision connectivity among courses, we envision integrating internship experiences with the curriculum. With a restructured general education system and an enhanced internship approach, a 4x4 curricular structure makes good sense. We want to start students off with courses that require extensive reading/writing/analysis. As each course is now one quarter of the academic load, it will require proportionately more effort and attention. With skillful rethinking of majors, the same habits/attitudes required by the general education requirements would be carried on into all other courses.

This particular scenario does not necessarily envision an increase in seat time per course. Rather, this scenario incorporates the principles of "course redesign" that seek to promote enhanced learning through carefully developed and explicitly stated learning outcomes, learner-centered pedagogies, more rigorous assessment of learning, and the creative application of technology.

A shift to the 4x4 model is expected to release resources to be reallocated to the academic enterprise through faculty incentives, transition costs, and investment in academic programs and associated faculty lines. In particular, it will allow the schools to have greater flexibility when considering issues including the following: reducing reliance on part-time faculty members, adjusting faculty teaching loads, establishing optimal class sizes on a course-by-course basis, and providing incentives for faculty-student collaboration in research projects.

Faculty support is essential for this transformation to achieve its goals. Faculty members will provide resources through their time investment in the major changes called for - both at the departmental and course levels. To be forthcoming, their investment must be expected, recognized, and compensated.

Conversion to a 4x4 model is best accomplished through a carefully managed project executed over a 24-36 month period. A critical path with appropriate milestones and time intervals needs to be established.

Next Steps

This week, it is expected that the Task Force Report will be distributed to the undergraduate schools and to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee with the expectation that they will review the Report. The objective of this review will be for the individual schools to consider thoroughly a conversion of their respective curricula to a 4x4 model from the viewpoint of enhancing student academic engagement with associated enhanced learning outcomes. I hope all of you here today will consider the recommendation of the Task Force seriously in the context of our vision for GW to “become one of the preeminent ... research universities in the nation and the world, recognized for its excellence in selected areas that are primarily derived from existing programmatic strengths in teaching, scholarship, and externally-funded research across the disciplines.”

Thank you!

The Same Species: Faculty, Administrators and University Governance

They tell me that someone has characterized this Assembly as something akin to Daniel in the lions' den—with one lion and a pride of Daniels. No, not so, no more apt than likening the event to Jonah in the belly of the beast. We meet as colleagues and members of the same species to boot.

As you know, this is my last chance as president to talk to you. I am going to try to make it count by giving what amounts to two speeches. The first is about some things I believe we are getting wrong. The second is about university governance and, in particular, the faculty's participation in governance.

Now, I hope you didn't bristle when I referred to some things we are getting wrong. If you did, please let me explain. I think there are a lot of things GW and higher education in general are getting right. I think you know what those things are, and so you don't need me to point them out to you. All right, just for the record I'll suggest your teaching and scholarship.

Also for the record, there are three things I'm aware of that we are getting wrong. Mind you, I said "we," not you. And by that I mean the whole institution—or rather its various Homo sapiens members. The three things are all problems in the way we prepare graduate students to be academics.

The first of the wrong things is that we are not teaching our doctoral students how to write. Much of what they produce is unintelligible even to other academics outside their discipline. Granted: there are terms of art, even jargon, that on occasion may be unavoidable. But only, I think, on rare occasion. If well educated people and even colleagues in another department cannot readily make sense of what someone has written, the point of writing it all down in the first place has been defeated or perhaps betrayed.

A couple of years ago, when the Writing Committee was working to produce what became UW20 and the writing-in-the-disciplines program, I happened to be copied on some e-mails from members of the committee. I was taken aback by how awkwardly written many of them were—and this from members of the writing committee!

The argument that e-mail is different from other forms of writing is specious. It may be more casual, upper case letters do not seem to

be chic, and proofreading is over-rated. Well, no. But even allowing for a more casual style, why these mysterious passive-voices—who is the actor here, anyway?—self-contradictory sentences, four syllables where one will do... you get the idea.

This is not, I hasten to add, a unique GW problem: it's pandemic in the Academy. But that does not imply that we cannot have a GW Solution which, ideally, could be copied elsewhere. The Solution is simple. Our doctoral programs should teach their graduate students how to write. Many fields, I know, have certain stylistic conventions, some of them sensible, others indefensible. I think it would be a grand thing if our programs taught our students to *think* like, say, a physicist or a political scientist, but to *write* like a man or woman of the world. It is after all the rest of the world with whom academics should be engaging, not just colleagues and peers in the discipline.

I don't imagine that we cannot teach our doctoral candidates how to write plain workmanlike prose. We need the... I was about to say will, but I think it's better to say the determination to do so and do so successfully.

The second wrong thing is that we are not training our PhD students to teach. Most PhD candidates intend to teach. For example, a student who enters our program in biology is trained to be a biologist, but not to be a *teacher* of biology. This is not a quibbling difference. Such an academic might well conduct research, but she is going to earn a consequential portion of her living in the classroom, not the research laboratory, and the odds are he most likely will never get an R01 grant from the National Institutes of Health.

Even as the president emeritus of GW, I would take great pride in knowing that the University was pioneering in its efforts to make sure that our students, once they have completed their work and earned their doctorate, will arrive at their first jobs—their first—and in the first semester—the first—knowing how to engage their students with what they are teaching them. On-the-job-training in a university is unacceptable: the students and their parents have paid dearly for instruction. Young teachers should not be learning pedagogy for the first time starting with real degree matriculants. If we make sure our new PhDs are classroom-ready—perhaps using our School of Education to help—the world will beat a path to our door.

The third wrong thing is that we do not teach our graduate students anything about university governance. This is a shame. In PhD programs across the country, not just at GW, we are preparing people who, by and large, expect to join the Academy as teachers. They expect to become expert in a certain field, and that is their goal. It is not the fault of our graduate students that they do not clamor for instruction in governance: they probably, at that time of their lives, do not know there is such a thing. Why should they? They have been students, bent on acquiring, as Michel de Montaigne said more than 400 years ago, either a well-filled head or at least a well-stuffed one.

Their object since they entered pre-school has been to acquire information and knowledge. And the source of addressing these noble goals has been largely book learning. And, I hasten to add, book learning on particular subjects which we have decided to label "academic." University governance is not an academic topic except in higher education programs—and then universities are often lumped in with non-profits in general even though they are very different in nature and structure.

This is where the problem arises. But it continues to have a life of its own. Junior faculty concentrate on staying hired, publishing, and getting tenure. And by the time they have successfully joined the ranks of the *tenurati*, they have tuned out.

I have witnessed the results of this paucity of familiarity with governance. I regularly have lunch with small groups of GW faculty. I have done so for over 15 years. When I ask them what they know about how the University is run or what problems it is facing, they come up empty. They are generally not familiar with the University's history or its short-term future plans, the workings of the Board and the Faculty Senate, nor do they keep up with University news by reading *By George*, *The Daily Colonial* online, or *The Hatchet*.

Few if any are aware that the District of Columbia has put a cap on the number of faculty and students we can have on campus at one time. Yet this will have an impact—and perhaps not a very happy one—on their professional lives. I'll return to this.

Along with knowing how to write and teach, we must make an effort to be sure our graduate students know how the University works. We should see these three areas as integral to the course of Ph.D. study, not additions: they are not. They are part of the equipment every university professor should have at the ready and be able to

put to use.

And so ends my first speech. On the short side. For me. My second speech is about university governance. Not the *teaching* of university governance, but as part of your contribution to the University—and to your own well-being. That is, the *practice* of university governance by faculty.

I want to begin with a quiz. It has only one question. I do not want a show of hands and the results will in no way affect your final grade.

How many of you know who Margaret Spellings is? I'm assuming that a significant number of you do not know. If I'm wrong, forgive me, but even if only a few do not know, then I am troubled. She is the U.S. Secretary of Education. She recently received a report from the Commission on the Future of Higher Education which she asked for about a year ago. Some of the recommendations of the Commission's report are startling, and could have great consequences for all here today.

For example, the Commission proposed that the Department of Education pay those institutions that agree to national standardized testing in order to improve the "accountability" of colleges and universities. Did you know that? And do you understand what it implies? As Sam Dillon, a reporter for *The New York Times*, wrote it is misguided for "schools to test and compare learning outcomes among such disparate students as physics scholars at Caltech and dance majors at Juilliard."¹

This will affect all faculty because every time we lose a chance at federal money, we lose opportunities for research and instruction and all the other things in a university's portfolio. It is also ill-advised. As Dillon's article makes clear, one test cannot universally measure results, desirable or otherwise. Then maybe someone will propose multiple tests? How many? Or imagine two students at GW, both all-stars and a lock to graduate *summa cum laude*: he is an English major, she's in engineering. Can anyone here today think of a single test that will accurately and plausibly reflect what they have accomplished while at GW as students? I don't see how. Nor do I see achieving "transparency" or "accountability" through a standardized test. Moreover, I think using money in this way is, at least arguably, inappropriate.

¹ September 27, 2006, p. A20

My point, however, is not the behavior of the Department of Education. My point is that this is something that could alter the terms of engagement on this campus and every other one you might be associated with. This challenge is not merely institutional: it is equally individual or personal because it addresses your profession—how you will do your work. Grade school teachers are complaining bitterly about teaching to the test because of the No Child Left Behind mandates. High school teachers for years have found themselves—like it or not—teaching to the SATs. Do you want to do that? That is not teaching. That is cramming and should have perished about the time Dickens described Gradgrind in *Hard Times*.

That is why faculty need to know what is going on if they are to have a constructive operative role in how the university will be administered and in helping the University proceed in what, I think, will be daunting times directly ahead. And that is why I think all of us should read *The Chronicle of Higher Education* weekly—or daily online—and to read *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and maybe *The Wall Street Journal* regularly. We need to follow the national debate on tuition, academic labor, early admissions, merit aid, tax exempt status of higher education, and similar matters.

I just referred to the possibly hard times ahead for us. If you were distracted from that phrase by the reading list I just proposed, let me explain. Most universities do not get much of their operating costs directly from the federal government, but every cent we get from them helps. And keep in mind that scholarship money for students is important for us. Because, when tuition is paid, it is the university that gets the money. A decline in the appropriation for Pell Grants or simply a constant amount not even adjusted for inflation impacts colleges. Yet, universities will be in a fiercer competition than ever with other huge demands on Uncle Sam's budget. The costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—even if those conflicts ended tomorrow—will have to be paid for. The staggering costs associated with the retirements of the Baby Boomers will have to be dealt with.

If we are going to get a reasonable share of federal largess against this kind of competition, we had better be ready to make our case: again, *we* includes *you*. Administrators alone are not going to be so persuasive and dispositive as we will be in concert with you. But you have to know the issues before you can help govern. And I suppose it is a plausible assumption that a professoriat that is silent on these matters is indifferent to these matters.

Remember, we are not Harvard. It warms the imagination just to think of the annual income on Harvard's \$30 billion. The MIT endowment contributed \$345 million to the 2007 operating budget. We are not rich. We pay about 90% of our bills from tuition income. Like a theater, we sell seats. With luck, when I leave the presidency next summer, the endowment of the University may be as much as \$1.2 billion. Well, that's up from the \$200 million it was when I came. But it's a full billion dollars shy of being in the middle—the middle—of our market basket. We will remain tuition dependent for a long time to come.

If you have been reading *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, you know that 25 universities are embarked on capital campaigns to raise *at least* a billion dollars—eleven of those seek \$2 billion; Columbia \$4 billion; Stanford \$4.3 billion. We should be doing the same thing, and we will. One reason I am leaving the presidency, as young as I am, instead of in one or two years' time is that I did not want to start another capital campaign, then distract it by leaving.

So I will leave the experience of raising another billion dollars to my successor and to you. But not to my successor as a solo performance. Do not think that there is a magical president who can weave straw into gold. This is no silver bullet. GW does not need a president who is de facto an absentee fundraiser. The University as we know it now—and as I think we should know it in the future—deserves a president who is hands-on and informed. Yes, the Board needs to provide its share of any fundraising goal, as do administrators. But what about you? And who better than the faculty—who present the president with shopping lists for laboratories and libraries and computers and some things that defy description—to devise useful ideas for raising some of the money to pay for their agenda? Or for making the case yourselves. Do you think any president really knows more than a physicist about what equipment we need in the labs? More than a business professor about what should go—and, in fact, did go—into Duquès Hall?

Obviously not. Yet fundraising is part of university governance—it's the tax that goes with the spending. And the best governance wrings the most expertise out of everyone involved. Everyone.

The problem is that very few faculty, as I have already suggested, are involved sufficiently in university governance or even care much about it. Then there are a small number who are rather over-engaged in it. Here's a story for you. A short one. Some of the

members of the Faculty Senate who welcomed me with enthusiasm when I arrived as President 19 years ago, will—I know—welcome me with equal enthusiasm to the faculty next fall. This is not a barb aimed at any individual good friend of mine. It is merely an observation. It strikes me as both amusing and somehow a matter of concern.

I have respectfully, even lovingly, poked good-natured fun at the Senate on an occasion or two. I believe that, if it did not exist, we would have to invent it. I owe it and those who have served during my tenure a great debt. We all do. Yet, the problem I see is this: A relatively small group of people have been making the faculty's contribution to university governance for a generation—or more. There are no term limits on service as there are with the Board of Trustees or the Administration. There should be. After a first term in the senate, a *tenurato* can simply run again—and some do. It makes me think of Robert Byrd among the living and Strom Thurmond among the other kind: professional senators for life.

I think term limits would be, as mathematicians put it, the elegant solution to a perceived shortcoming and the need for fresh air. And I also think it would be a good idea to allow untenured faculty membership on the Senate. Both possibilities would broaden the representation. Both would also, I think, improve democratic participation in the University's governance because we would have a wider and deeper pool of talent—and a greater diversity of points of view. As it is, the Senate is not broadly representative; and, if I may speak frankly, not particularly hospitable to new ideas and change. How do we understand a Presidential Search Committee to which no woman faculty member is elected, no faculty member of color, no full time member of the largest faculty—the Columbian School?

The Senate—and I imagine this may be true in many other universities—is conservative. Extremely conservative. This is not true of senators individually. I know them to be sound thinkers and good people. But the senate, institutionally, is. And this makes shared governance often a frustrating endeavor. Let me give you two examples, briefly.

You know what they are: my proposal to reform the academic calendar, which was buried under 17 *Whereases* in a Senate resolution that, simply expressed, said, "We don't want to talk about it, ever," and my proposal to go to a four-by-four course load, which has been passed from one committee to another.

I will not repeat the virtues of changing the calendar to create three terms. I will simply pronounce one longish sentence:

The University has a cap on enrollment mandated by the city; therefore, it can no longer increase enrollment in the two fourteen-week fall and spring terms; but, it could increase the enrollment of the University—and remain in full compliance with the municipal mandate—by adding a third fourteen-week semester and have ten weeks left over.

That commentary is a little longer than the First Amendment to the Constitution, so I apologize, but I think it's worth taking to heart if not learning by heart.

Let me explain why I think so because this goes to the core of a serious question on governance. The City also restricts the number, size and location of buildings we can construct. Our capacity to add classrooms and to renovate old buildings for instructional use are also restricted by city regulation—and budget constraints. A four-by-four course structure would allow us to allocate our resources more efficiently, intelligently and improve our curriculum. And by the way, NYU, Duke, Northwestern, Emory, BU, and USC—six of our 11 market basket schools—have already completely eliminated three-by-five or are poised to do so. It's not a radical notion. Refusal to acknowledge these realities will hobble our future. Those who resist innovation define our limits.

You know about the Foggy Bottom Neighborhood Association. They give the word "neighbor" a really special spin. The Foggy Bottom Neighborhood Association is comparatively small, but they have managed to make a noise about everything GW does. Or doesn't do. One resident was incensed that GW would not provide lighting and police on the walkway by the Potomac leading to Washington Harbour. Never mind that the land is federal property, never mind that is not our neighborhood, never mind that it is beyond our means... oh, never mind.

And a woman, who opposed the new GW Hospital, predicted that moving the ER entrance from 22nd Street and Pennsylvania Avenue about 100 yards to 23rd Street just below Pennsylvania Avenue would result in carnage—I think she actually used that word. Well, carnage has not ensued.

But the neighbors endure. Most are wonderful and thoughtful and you want to hug them. They are family. Others are fighting our new campus plan, invoking red herring after red herring. You can read all about it in *The Hatchet*, hardly a tool of this administration, in the September 25 edition. The only explanation I can make for the hostile neighbors is that a few have too much time on their hands.

The issues I have talked about today—fundraising, curriculum, the Senate, the neighbors, among others—are your issues. The way we govern the university is nothing you can leave to others. It is your future. Take a city cap on our enrollment and add an inefficient calendar and you reduce our ability to heal ourselves. That means fewer professors, fewer raises, fewer classrooms, fewer opportunities. It means a diminished university.

Let us review GW's spectacular rise in just a few years. I take a great deal of pride of how GW has grown and excelled. I hope you have the same sense of pride—and not as a pride of Daniels, but as members of a genuine scholarly community. I hope that you will see how vital university governance is and, then, how active a part you ought to be playing in it. *Ought*, not *could*.

I hope you know that my desire to have a summer term and a four-by-four load is not part of a dark conspiracy, but an earnest effort to keep GW operating as happily and prosperously as we possibly can. By taking a hand in governance and by becoming intimate with the issues—like zoning and enrollment caps—you can participate more fully and realize that what administrators propose is arguably for the benefit of the faculty and the students... and the city we are part of.

Well, enough. I hope I have made my point. Let me wish you Godspeed and end as I began, reminding you that we belong to the same species and, more importantly, the same entity. And I pray that some things I have said today will give you a greater sense of urgency than my previous talks. And maybe to prove another point, when I join the faculty, I just might run for the Faculty Senate. After all, who would better understand the celebrated perfidy and venality of the administration than I? Who could better foil it? Or turn it to the faculty's account?

But on second thought...