CALL TO ORDER

The Assembly was called to order by President Knapp at 2 p.m. He welcomed all of the members of the Assembly, particularly the new faculty present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular Faculty Assembly held on October 2, 2012 were approved as distributed.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW FACULTY

President Knapp called upon the deans to introduce faculty members newly appointed in their schools.

REMARKS BY NELSON A. CARBONELL, JR., CHAIR, GW BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Chair Carbonell’s remarks about faculty governance are included with these minutes.

REMARKS BY STEVEN KNAPP, UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

President Knapp’s remarks are included with these minutes.

REMARKS BY STEVEN LERMAN, PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Provost Lerman’s remarks are included with these minutes.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Professor Scheherazade Rehman, Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, welcomed everyone to the Assembly and included a special welcome to new faculty and emeriti faculty present. The Report of the Senate is included with these minutes.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Assembly, President Knapp adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m. after inviting everyone to the reception in the Brady Gallery on the second floor of the MPA building.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary
Thank you Mr. President and thank you for having me today. First I would like to extend my welcome and the board’s welcome to our new faculty. It’s wonderful to see new additions to our faculty at the George Washington University. It’s my pleasure to address you today, our GW faculty because while we see our location in the heart of the nation’s capital as a tremendous asset, we all know that our most valuable asset sits in this room today and that’s you, our faculty. Without you nothing happens here. You allow us to teach, to do research and ultimately to be of service to our local, national and global community. I have been board chair now for three months and I’m getting better at it, however I’ve been on the board of trustees for over a decade and I was a student here in the 1980s when George Washington University was not really like it is now at all. So, I know this place as well as any board member can. I don’t know it nearly as well as many of you do so what I wanted to do this afternoon is cover three things about the board.

First, a little about the role of the board at the institution and how it has operated historically, and going forward. Second, is a little about our strategy, and then finally to talk about our goals. Now that’s a little upside down but you’ll see why I’m doing it this way. The bylaws of the institution state that the management direction and governance of the university shall be invested in the Board of Trustees. What does that really mean? So the board has what all boards have and that is, first, duties. We have a duty of care, and a duty of loyalty, and you can read that as a duty of stewardship. This institution has stood for 192 years and our first goal is to make sure that it is still here when we’re finished for future generations.

We have a duty of oversight, sometimes it can be called a fiduciary duty and that is to really oversee the operations of the institution’s budget, granting of tenures and degrees. Finally, our role is to help set the strategic direction in collaboration with the administration and with you the faculty. So I’ll talk a little bit about how the board is organized because for me it is important for this to be as transparent as possible. The more you know, the less that you will fear what the board might do and the more hopeful you might be that we’ll get it right. The board organizes itself in committees and we have committees which allow us to discharge our duties of oversight. They are committees like finance and audit, academic affairs, governance and nominations. These committees do important work from, as I said, passing the budget, to nominating your trustees, to granting of degrees. We have other committees that help us do our oversight work such as development and alumni relations, student affairs, and so on.

The committees allow us to organize our oversight work because as a board of 37 members, it would be impossible for us to educate every single member about every single issue. The committees are where the work gets done. The second role that the board organizes itself around is strategy. Now you know that in May the board passed Vision 2021, a strategic plan for the third century of the George Washington University. I would say we enthusiastically
and unanimously passed that plan, because not only did the board have ability to have input into the plan, but we realized that it was a collaborative effort amongst the administration, the faculty and many others to weigh in. I think it is a terrific starting point as a strategy. I would caution that strategy does not survive contact with the enemy, so we will be changing things as it makes sense to change them. I want to give kudos to Steve Lerman and his team because I think the strategic plan is terrific. Thank you, Steve.

It has four pillars in it - innovation, globalization, really to expand our programs around governance and policy and then to do something we call citizenship and leadership. I think we’ve always done well but never put quite as good a label to it. So how does the board really weigh in on strategy? Well, first the board has strategic committees. Historically we have done these – for example, there was a committee on the Science and Engineering Hall, which I chaired. We met for a total of seven years prior to approval. So if you think we do things precipitately, you would be wrong about that. We also have a board committee about sustainability today where we’re really looking at not only how we run our campus but the programs that we have around sustainability; the research and the scholarship we have around it. I think we’ve done good work there to really put GW at the forefront in terms of sustainability efforts.

The board organizes itself to look at those strategic initiatives and we’ll continue to do that going forward. Last May Chairman Ramsey put forward a resolution asking the next board chair (that would be me) to assemble a group of trustees, faculty and administrators to review the current Faculty Code and recommend revisions to align the code with the strategic plan, and to make sure we have the best code possible to execute the plan that we’ve all agreed to. The Code would reflect best practices in higher education and we would revise any elements which may be outdated or unclear. So let me tell you a little bit about how the board is going to go about doing this because it’s a little more than what we’ve done in sustainability.

I have to tell you a quick story. Probably the most meaningful thing I’ve ever done as a trustee at the George Washington University was participate in the presidential search. That search resulted in Steve Knapp being appointed the 16th president of the George Washington University, and I see some of you in the room that were on that committee with me. It was really a unique opportunity to shape the future of the way that this university would move forward, and I have to say I think we got it right. But that committee only had 15 members. We had a community of thousands of people that are here every day. Tens of thousands of people that care about what we do, and hundreds of thousands of people who would qualify as spectators and fans that we also wanted to reach out to. The process that we used was one where we reached out to faculty, to staff, to students, to alumni, and to the neighborhood, believe it or not. I met with the D.C. City Council and we had a task force which really had a primary objective and that was to shape the job description of who we were looking for and the goals that we would set for them to achieve. The results of that were that the committee got a very accurate description of what the community wanted and I think we got a terrific result with President Knapp showing up.
That, as a guiding strategy for the Faculty Code review, will be to assemble a task force like we did in the presidential search that includes again trustees, faculty, and administrators. To go out to you, the faculty, and ask what you want. If you know the strategic plan, if you know how this institution operates today, we want to hear from our faculty. What are things we need to do to align how we operate with the strategy that we have? Perhaps you've come from other institutions and you've seen better practices and we want to know what those are, and we certainly want to know where are those areas where we need to add clarity. The task force will then make a set of recommendations, and then we'll go forward with any changes. That's the only agenda. I have to say that the last time I met with a faculty group I had not read the Faculty Code. But, I read it last night just to make sure that I could answer that question. Going forward we will have other initiatives when the board meets in October that we will discuss strategically for the George Washington University.

I want to close with this. The other night I was at the Alumni Achievement Awards which are really a terrific gathering of GW alumni. I have to say that I always leave those awards feeling wonderful about GW, but a little bit inadequate. Somebody came to me, actually one of the recipients, and said, “What’s changed in your 10 years on the board?” I thought, well we have some new buildings, and we have a new administration, a new president. We certainly have brought in some terrific faculty members. What’s different can’t really be pinned down to any of those, because 10 years ago when I was on this board the conversation was all about what we can’t do. We can’t raise money, we’re not good at it, we can’t do this, and it’s really not for us. It had moments of being demoralizing. Today we don’t have those conversations anymore. Today it’s all about what we can do and what we will do.

Our goal is to move the George Washington University to be amongst the most respected and admired institutions of higher learning in the world. But we can only do that together, and I’m counting on all of you for support. Thank you very much.
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Thank you, Mr. Carbonell, for that very helpful presentation on the board and its agenda for this year. I’m going to be relatively brief. I want to leave room, having just heard from the chair, we do want to hear about the implementation of the strategic plan, which is the next thing coming up from the provost. Because we are, despite of what I said earlier, committed to not spending too much of your time this afternoon. I would acknowledge the new faculty additions this year; I was glad when we had the introductions that one of the people introduced was a new faculty member, Laura Brown, who is in the Graduate School of Political Management. We just had our Alumni Weekend this past weekend and one of the events was what we call the Political Brunch.

Professor Brown moderated a discussion between two representatives of the opposite parties that are governing the nation at the moment, and those were former Senator Trent Lott and former congressman and Secretary of Agriculture and George Washington University alumnus Dan Gilman. We also learned that Senator Lott had studied here, but had never actually earned a degree. So in a sense we had an alumni panel. On that occasion they were wearing sort of an acute gesture, they were wearing the opposite color ties so Mr. Gilman was wearing a red tie and Senator Lott was wearing blue tie. Their topic was bi-partnership and I have to say that although the panel did not succeed in averting the closing of the government, it certainly succeeded in explaining things. And that’s what we do, of course, as an educational research institution.

It was one of the highlights of Alumni Weekend which, by the way, had 60 events and the largest turnout of alumni we’ve ever had. We had more than 2,000 alumni registered and others dropped in. That’s been a growing phenomenon here. I think what we’re seeing are alumni increasingly getting excited about what’s going on at the university and wanting to be a part of that. What I want to emphasize about the weekend was how many of my conversations with alumni focused on the faculty members who had, in one way or another, changed their lives. You’re whom they remember, and who they were asking about. It’s always moving because I’ve had that experience with alumni. They do it around the world. When I visit alumni this happens as well, but it is a constant theme of conversations during the alumni reunion week and it really, I think, speaks to how important you all are in the lives of your students. You are who they really remember.

They can joke about parties they’ve attended, and even political events that occurred while they were here. What really seemed to grab their attention and their loyalty is their experience of having interacted with you during their years as students here. Of course the other thing they talked about, because I could guess they noticed, was the proliferation of cranes all over campus. They noticed the many projects and just how rapidly and how extensively the campus has grown since they were last on campus. As you know, we have no fewer than five major projects going on right now. I hope you’ve seen the initial benefits of the Gelman renovation which I think has been a tremendous improvement.
I was really struck and somehow disturbed when I arrived on campus and wanted to know where the library was, and I had to descend a littered stairway down several steps into a cavernous opening, which at that time featured a large metal box for dropping off videotapes that was called The Hippo, or something. It was a big blue metal box and you had to kind of walk around that to get into the library, and I thought that’s not a great message to have the university’s central repository of knowledge sort of cluttered in that way.

By moving the entrance around, we’ve gotten the entrance of the library away from the food trucks so we don’t have a litter problem. Now the entrance is upstairs -- you take a ramp upstairs to a well-lit floor instead of that cavernous entrance that we used to go through. That, I think is, that’s only the beginning of the renovation of the library and I think it’s a tremendous improvement. Just a block away from here we have the museum project which is scheduled to open on time next year. That’s proceeding rapidly. The new residence hall is the newest one of these two to break ground. I’m now experiencing a lot of the noise that you’ve been experiencing where your offices are located.

It is still going to be a tremendous project putting together three existing residence halls into a single complex, the benefit of which will be not just that it creates the residential spaces on campus that we need. It is part of our strategic plan agreement, rather our campus plan agreement with the city, to move more of our students onto campus and out of the neighborhoods, so we will be doing that. It also has the advantage of creating a new common space for students which will increase the level of sort of community interaction among our students within that complex. Of course if you drive up K Street toward Washington Circle you can’t fail to notice the newest looming and rather shining building there which is the new home of the School of Public Health and Health Services, which will be opening this spring. We’re all looking forward to the grand opening of that building. And finally, now three stories out of the ground and on its way to eight stories out of the ground is the Science and Engineering Hall. The board chair has already mentioned the long and collaborative process that led to the construction of that building.

Well of course building these facilities is just one of the ways we are achieving our aspiration of becoming an even more prominent research institution. But what really matters is the activity that goes on in those buildings. I thought you would be pleased to know that in an era in which you’re hearing a lot in the media, reading a lot in the press, about the decline in research funding pretty much across the board, and how many universities are seeing a reduction in support for their intellectual activities, we’re actually having the opposite phenomenon here. In the past month alone we received eight federal research grants in the seven figure range. A total of $13 million! What’s really striking about it is the range of those projects. Just to use a few examples, Assistant Professor Kate Applebaum in the School of Public Health and Health Services was awarded a $1.3 million grant from the CDC to study the effects of metal working fluids on kidneys. That four year project will follow some 46,000 autoworkers to make it one of the largest studies of its kind. Professor Barbara Miller from the Elliott School of International Affairs and Shaista Khilji from the Graduate School of
Education and Human Development received a $1 million dollar grant to build a partnership with Lahore College Women’s University in Pakistan. Part of the focus of a number of our faculty in this university is on educating and empowering women and girls as one of the key ways of addressing some of those pressing challenges in the world.

In fact, Dr. Jim Kim, the president of the World Bank, was on campus this morning. A number of you I think were present to hear him give this rather remarkable address about what the World Bank is doing around the globe. By the way, he’s the first academic of his type to ever take over the helm as the 12th president of the World Bank. The first one who actually has an academic background in medicine and public health and has been developing community health efforts around the world as part of his career. He was, of course, most recently the president of Dartmouth College before becoming president of the World Bank last July, and as he was speaking about the focus of the bank which is going to be increasingly on ending poverty. As a matter of fact, I realize I’m still wearing the pin that he gave me this morning which simply says “End Poverty.” That’s the mission of the World Bank, but he was saying one of the most important ways of accomplishing that is precisely the education and empowerment of women and girls. We’ve seen that as an important agenda for our university and I’m glad that Professor Miller will have that funding which will enable her to pursue that even further.

There are also other in medicine, and the Medical Faculty Associates are also increasingly acquiring funding to support their clinical and research efforts. Really it’s across the board. We have a great number of grants still in the pipeline so we expect this growth to continue. Many other institutions have experienced either a flattening or a reduction of their funding, and many federal agencies have had their budgets reduced pretty dramatically. NIH for example, the National Institutes of Health, has seen its external funding drop 8.5% this past year. But in fiscal year ‘13, the previous fiscal year, our research grew 7.2% so we were 7.2% up while everyone else including the government is going down. We’re expecting between 6 and 9% growth this year, so I sort of mentioned that to you because I think it is an encouraging sign that some of the things that we’re doing to support our faculty both with facilities and other kinds of aid in the research arena are paying off. What’s really paying off is we continue to attract very high-caliber faculty from top institutions really around the nation and around the world.

You just introduced a number of those who have just joined us this year and so that’s what we really need to see continuing, and we’ve been in a fortunate position in part because of the stewardship of the board in advance of the financial downturn. We never had to stop or freeze our hiring, let alone cut back on our faculty numbers or do anything to cut back on our faculty salaries or research support during this whole period of a very slow economic recovery. I don’t take credit for that because the reserves that have enabled that to happen were built up as a result of the stewardship of the board in years preceding my arrival, but it has worked extremely well. Of course what’s going to guide us as we continue to progress over the next ten years is the strategic plan that as you’ve heard was adopted unanimously by our board back in May. It was the result of an extraordinarily collaborative process in
which the Provost hosted, I don’t know how many dinners. I’ve heard this before, but it’s a very large number of dinners with faculty... At least five pounds of dinners. So what you’re going to hear about today, don’t worry you’re not going to get another summary of the strategic plan, as much as the provost enjoys producing that. I enjoy it as well, but what you will get is a sense of what we’re now doing to implement the plan. My goal, the board’s goal, and the provost’s goals throughout this whole process has been to produce a plan that would not be what most plans become, which is a doormat on a shelf in an office someplace. Rather, it would be a document that would actually have a genuine impact in helping us move into our third century. I’d like to bring to the podium Provost Steve Lerman to talk about how we’re proceeding to implement the strategic plan that we’ve just adopted. Thank you.
First of all, thank you very much. As always it’s a pleasure to get together with the entire faculty. I’m beginning my fourth year here at GW, it sort of astonishes me in some ways. I do remember the first one of these faculty assemblies I addressed, and of course, at that point I knew almost nobody here in this audience. Of course many of you were probably here — those of you who are faculty assembly groupies — and so, it’s come to me, when I look out I actually now know an incredible large number of you. Of course that happened through many ways. Part of it was just day to day operations of being a provost and interacting with faculty, but a good deal of my acquaintance with the faculty has come through the strategic planning process. And so among the many side benefits other than obviously producing a plan, one of the things that strategic planning process can do is bring us together for conversation, and so the many dinners and lunches and other events that were held (almost 100 of them during the planning process) has a side effect of not only letting me get to know more of the faculty of the university, but my hope and aspiration was that many of you got to talk to each other during that process when you might not otherwise have done so.

The plan obviously rose from an enormous amount of conversation, some of which was fascinating, some of it was very important as input to the plan, and some of it which we ultimately came to the conclusion didn’t belong in the plan. However we got there, the plan as produced, as Chair Carbonell said, was unanimously endorsed by the trustees. They were deeply involved in its production in terms of commenting on the ideas, but the truth is and as he noted in his remarks, much of the plan, the ideas in the plan came from you the faculty. Ultimately, no plan can be successful unless it reflects ideas and concepts about where the faculty itself wants to go as a university. We as a university are driven by our individual and our collective interests, and strategic plans have to reflect both of those, but with a strong emphasis on those things that brings it together.

As Chair Carbonell said, there are some broad pillars upon which the plan rests. But rather than reiterate the conversations we had many times before, today what I would like to specifically turn to is at least my thinking informed by a lot of conversation with people in this audience and elsewhere, about what should be the first actions in the plan that we roll out. Chair Carbonell already alluded the fact that plans have to change in their dynamic, but at least in the first year the actions we chose to take on first are probably those that are already in the plan because if the plans are irrelevant already we’ve got a serious problem. So let me tell you my thinking on this, and of course I will welcome, over the next coming academic year, your thoughts. As we talk about this year’s actions, we’re also going to have a parallel conversation about what would come next, and we’re always going to be looking out a year or two ahead. I think looking out eight or ten years, while interesting in the planning process, probably isn’t the most productive way to think about actions.

The actions we will take will be dictated each year by what makes the most sense then. It’s quite probable that some of the actions of the plan will never really get implemented
because, at the time we come to think about them as being implementable, we may come to the conclusion they make no sense at all. Then there will be things that arise in the course of the next decade that were not in the plan, but nevertheless turn out to be very strategically important. But with that said we can look ahead at least a year and let me tell you my thoughts on this. I have divided the actions we should contemplate taking around clusters of areas and there are really three big clusters. They really aligned with the plan and the things that are important to us.

The first grouping of activities is around education, our academic programs. In that area, we’ll be looking at probably taking about six different sets of actions – some of them large and some of them small. So a couple of small ones: one of the ideas that came out of the plan was to improve our academic advising so that students can take advantage of greater flexibility. Even a simple idea, which actually was student driven, was to allow our online advising system, called Degree Map (and many of you have probably used it), to allow students to explore different scenarios in majors and double majors. Now why is that important? Because it relates to a bigger thing we’re going to be doing, which is to begin the process of moving us to undergraduate admissions where we don’t admit by school but we admit to the university writ large. Now most of that in this year will be subtle changes, and what form will those changes take? First of all, how we present ourselves as a university will change.

We will write admissions letters that say congratulations you’re admitted to study at the George Washington University. That’s not that substantive. But maybe the important side effect is another action in which we’re going to begin eliminating what is a mystifying maze of restrictions on how you can transfer from one department or school to another and what double majors you can have. If you actually pick up our bulletin, in either print or actually go online and look at it, we have these bizarre set off restrictions where if you’re a major in one school you can’t major in another particular department. I’m sure each of those was written at a time when they meant a lot of sense for some reasons, but added up they’re a set of unnecessary barriers to our students’ education.

Our students are out in front of us on this. They want the flexibility to construct majors and double majors or combinations of majors and minors that are not necessarily aligned with how we’ve chosen to organize our schools and departments. That strong sense is reinforced. One of the things I’ve done a couple of times is sit in on sessions when high school students come here to visit for the admissions briefing. Our admissions staff does a wonderful job; we just changed the briefing recently, it’s a great briefing. Every one that I sat in on — I think it’s about three but it’s not a large sample size but I’m told it’s very common — some parent or student raises his or her hand and says ‘What happens if my son or daughter applied for admission to the business school and then decide they want to major in engineering?’

Now at many universities the answer is you fill out a form and change your major. That’s sort of the standard in many universities and so do the great ones we compete with. Here the answer is believe it or not you go back to the admissions office and essentially get readmitted. It’s not a full admissions process, but that is a less than satisfying answer to our students. Our
students conceptualize themselves as students of the university and see no particularly good reason to go back to the admissions office. This year we’re going to eliminate that, change the wording, and give them tools to Degree Map augmentations that allow them to explore the full range of possible majors and double majors and minors and construct their academic programs and then go to advisers who of course are well informed about what they should do.

We also want to begin the conversation, and this is going to be a conversation predominantly with the faculty, around this notion of citizenship and leadership. In particular can we construct a highly marginalized set of requirements that gives students an experiential learning experience or actually a set of them around citizenship and leadership? What would it be like if we had every student who, for example, did an internship in some part of the government (assuming it’s going to be operating soon) had to write a reflective essay about what they had experienced when they finished? One of the things we try to encourage in the citizenship and leadership idea is reflection. We do not have a shortage of our students going out and doing amazing things. One of the signatures of this great university is in this amazing energy that our students have. What we probably need to get more of though, is them coming back from those experiences and reflecting upon them and learning from them, becoming what Don Schon, who wrote a wonderful book called *The Reflective Practitioner*, described as how you take what you’ve learned in your classroom and take what you did next in the citizenship or leadership experience and integrate the two and find the gaps. Maybe the fact is that classroom experience you took that was supposed to mean something doesn’t actually inform your real activity.

That’s an important experience for students to have, to reflect upon how what they do in classroom activities inform their actions. We want to sit with the faculty, work through some ideas, we want to acknowledge all sorts of leadership activities. This won’t be a recipe book, it’ll be more like a menu in which a student might learn the qualities and attributes of leadership by being the president of a student organization or being a co-captain on an athletics team, but the key element of all that, at least in the way that we’re envisioning this, is the integration of the experience and deep reflection on that experience in some ways. And that, over some period of time in the four years we have them as undergraduates, they would build a portfolio of these of some scale. Some will be about leadership, some will be about citizenship, some might be about service and again we have lots of students doing a lot of things in these areas. We want to bring some structure and learning experience to those experiences.

Lastly, we want to continue our emphasis on STEM initiatives, and in particular, looking at opportunities for our students maybe who are not STEM majors to learn something about STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) and look at ways to encourage more of them to go into STEM fields and contribute back. So areas we’ve been having conversations around, and these are just for examples, are should we create a program where students who are in STEM majors also learn how to become STEM teachers if that might interest them. We know in this country there’s a shortage of highly qualified teachers in many of the STEM fields at the high school level. Many of our high school students are being taught, for example, physics, by people who are not physics majors. Can we contribute to solving a
problem by having a system where our students who are so inclined not only learn STEM fields but learn how to be STEM teachers as well?

This is a medium size collection of actions we’d like to initiate this year and have done by the start of the next academic year. My fondest wish is to be able to come back to the next Faculty Assembly and report back: we did this. Then tell you next year what we want to do moving forward.

There is a second cluster — so that first cluster was around education — the second cluster is around cross-disciplinary research. For those of you who failed to memorize the plan, one of the areas we emphasized that was under that pillar is that we should construct and create and initiate a rather small number of interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary institutes that focus on issues and problems that are either of national or global importance.

President Knapp already spoke about a grant in one of those areas. We have something called the Global Women’s Institute led by Mary Ellsberg that was actually created by many faculty; Barbara Miller is one of the people involved in that. So that work is continuing but we want to create a couple of others. Let me talk a little bit about some of the ideas. Each of these institutes would have some portfolio of four areas, but not every institute would have all four. One of the areas is research, which I think all the institutes would have, a second area is educational programs, and a third area would be outreach — using the importance of our place to help convene practitioners together and reach out to those communities that are relevant, and then the last area is actual practice -- what we actually do.

The best working example of an institute that has all four of these dimensions to some degree is the Sustainability Institute. Our work in sustainability has a research component obviously and what the faculty do. It has a minor for undergraduates in sustainability. It has an extensive outreach set of programs; we’ve hosted many events here on campus. Frank Sesno in the School of Media and Public Affairs has something called Planet Forward, which is a multimedia online presentation of issues around sustainability around the country and the world. And it has a practical aspect, which is, how do we as a university become more sustainable? That’s just one example of something we’ve already done.

We’re going to be looking to create some combination of those four different attributes in some other institutes. When we do that we’re going to have to address a whole series of important questions organizationally. For example, one of the questions is, how do we hire faculty whose primary research interest and perhaps whose primary teaching is done in one of these interdisciplinary institutes. Now one of the ideas would be that these faculty members would in effect have two homes. They would have a home department and they would have a home institute. But how do we deal with the questions of incentives, performance review, promotion and tenure for that set of faculty who might have, in effect, a dual loyalty? Many other universities have worked out this problem, I think for us it’s still relatively new and we need to talk through the faculty governance issues with the Senate and as we look at tenure and promotion processes, figure out how best to incentivize and reward those people who are
effective in having that dual identity. That work, when we create these new centers, is something we’ve just begun now. We’re beginning to hire faculty into some of our interdisciplinary research institutes also will also have departmental homes and we’re working through the processes and the agreements that need to be put in place to fairly reward those faculty who contribute actually to a department and also contribute in a cross-disciplinary research center.

That’s the second cluster, and we’ll probably think about creating one or two more institutes. I’ve already asked Dean Michael Brown to begin a conversation with other deans and faculty around an area that I think we may want to work on more, which is global economic development, something that GW has tremendous strength in already and that we can build upon. We’ll see how all of that shakes out as time goes on.

The third cluster of activities is international strategy. If you’ve read the strategic plan, you know that one of the pillars is globalization. Like many of the other areas, this is not new territory for us. We have an enormous range of international activities at GW. Sometimes they’re quite modest: a faculty member with one or two students goes over to some other country, or we host a couple of students from another country, maybe you have some in your own research groups or you have some in your classes — we do this all over the world.

We have colleagues on research grants globally. All of us to some extent or other have engaged internationally in some of our activities, but when we think more at the university level one of the things the strategic plan called for is beginning to look at picking a modest number of places outside the US and getting some critical mass in those areas where we think we can make a difference and where gain strategic strength, where we can learn from those places but also give back to those places, and where our students and our faculty can become more deeply engaged.

One of those areas that we’re looking at very hard is China. China is now the world’s second biggest economy. It’s the world’s most populous nation, and we already have significant scale activities there. We’re already recognized in China, and we were the only academic sponsor of the Fortune Global Forum in Chengdu recently. We have a position there already, but what we don’t have is a fully developed, coherent strategy. I have created an advisory committee of faculty who will advise on the specific formulation of the China strategy. We met the first time this week actually and we’re going to begin conversations by looking at what we’re already doing and asking what opportunities exist that make sense for GW. These will leverage our particular capabilities and strengths, what are the appropriate partners for us in China, and what should our goals be, and what should we try to accomplish there. I think there are enormous opportunities. I think there are also enormous questions and risks. None of these strategic options are ones that if done inappropriately don’t bear risk. We really need to think hard, and I’ve asked a group of faculty who’ve had deep experience in China to work with me on those questions. What should our strategy be, how should we execute it, who should our partners be, and how should we either take advantage of what we’re already doing or back away from what we’re doing to do something different? At this point, I think it’s a wide open
field. We don’t know exactly what we want to do but this is the year I think to figure that out and then begin the execution of the China strategy.

Of course there are many other regions where we have activities and need to have activities. We are deeply involved in parts of the Middle East, and sub-Saharan Africa; we have a presence in Latin America and parts of Asia. None of those activities will go away; we may also want to look at having a deeper engagement with some other region. I’ve adopted a bit of a philosophy, let’s bite off pieces that are small enough so that we can really gain some traction rather than trying to do everything at once. Over time we will be looking at other regions and other areas and asking these same questions about what our strategy is as well as what are our goals, who are our partners and what we should actually do in those regions. I think this is the year to get our China strategy straight, not to the exclusion of anything else but as a focus. Again, I look to the faculty’s wisdom to help me. Those are my thoughts today about what we need to do this year. My hope is to come back to a year from now as I told you and be able to report back and then tell you what’s next. I welcome everybody’s thoughts and input on this, so if you have ideas and thoughts about other things that are in the strategic plan that perhaps should have higher priority, just let me know.

Next steps: So one of the things we have to do is get together some working groups around these areas and as I said, we’ve already assembled a working group around China strategy. We’ll be asking some of you in this room to participate in planning and working groups in other areas. I think the other thing we need to look at is what the prerequisites are for making a lot of these things work. It’s been noted in the strategic plan that, for example, ultimately having ourselves perceived more by undergraduates as a single university and less as a collection of schools in that university probably requires a revision of the working budget model in the schools. That’s something that’s more like inside baseball in my office, but we’re having conversations with the deans already about a different way of thinking about the budgets for the schools and how we can do that in a way that’s more transparent, simpler to understand and creates the right incentives for the schools and the departments within the schools.

We’ll charter those working groups over the next month, between now and the end of October. My hope is to establish working groups in each of the relevant areas and then begin to get input from those working groups to get more actual work underway and begin the implementation phase. As always, I look forward to working with faculty on each of these. Some of you will be direct participants, others will just be interested in what happens; some of you will be deeply affected, others less affected, by these changes over the coming year. In any case, we’ll try to keep everyone up to date. For those of you who want to follow it, there’s a section of my own website where we will periodically do updates on the strategic planning process -- what we’re actually implementing, how it’s going, what the questions are and what progress we are making. This will be an interesting first year for this process. It will keep my office busy, and as I said, some of you I will ask to be of assistance. Many of you have been of great assistance already and for that I thank you. With that said it is my pleasure and honor to now turn the floor over to you for questions.
I would like to thank all the members of the assembly who are in attendance and extend a warm welcome to all present here today. In particular I would like to welcome all of the new GW faculty. We will do everything possible to assist you settling into campus life. Additionally I would like to thank the Emeriti faculty present for taking the time to attend and be involved in campus life.

This University has a historic precedent of shared governance. This is true within schools and the University at large. We expect and hope that all of you will uphold this tradition of shared governance. The Faculty Senate consists of faculty members elected from each degree-granting school at the University. Largely through the work of its committees, it has served for decades as the primary means for faculty participation in shared governance here at GW. It is our obligation as faculty to uphold and support this privilege and right. Those of us who serve on the Faculty senate understand it is implicit in our voluntary duty to represent all of you in the best possible way. Faculty senate members are your representatives, and I hope you will feel free to contact them for information about our campus community. We want to hear from you.

We are very glad to hear from our Board Of Trustees Chair Nelson Carbonell for providing the faculty with an overview of the Board Of Trustee’s interest and intent in reviewing the university governance. The Senate will work with Chair Carbonell and the Board on university governance through our prevailing system and mechanism of faculty shared governance.

In addition we are very glad to hear from Provost Lerman about Vision 2021 - the university strategic plan that will propel the University into the next decade. This plan has been approved by the Board of Trustees unanimously. The Senate and its committees will be working to discuss the implementation of the Statistic Plan during the current academic year.

Before I give you a few of my own personal remarks as Chair of the Senate Executive Committee I would like on behalf of the Faculty Senate to offer the following report that summarizes the Senate business.

During the 2012-13 session, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee established the agenda for nine regular meetings of the Faculty Senate. I will begin by giving a brief summary of Senate business which are first, the Senate resolutions and second, the Senate reports

**WITH REGARD TO RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE SENATE DURING THE 2012-13 SESSION:**

There were 3 resolutions: *The gist of the resolutions involved three themes:*

First, A Resolution To Endorse Amendments To The GWU Policy On Conflicts Of Interest And Commitment For Faculty And Investigators
Second, The Resolution On The Policy And Procedures For Sexual Harassment And Violence

The third item “A Resolution to Amend the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code with Respect to Dean Searches” has currently been deferred by the Administration while the Board of Trustees looks at university governance issues.

More detail about these resolutions can be obtained from the Senate Office. It will also be included with the final summary of Assembly business.

ON FACULTY SENATE REPORTS

The Executive Committee arranged for 19 reports to the Faculty Senate. These included:

1) a Report on the International Strategic Plan by Associate Provost Donna Scarboro.

2) an Update on the University Budget by Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee Joseph Cordes.

3) 7 reports by and open discussions with Provost Lerman on the development of the University’s Strategic Plan.

4) a report from Human Resources Vice President Sabrina Ellis about Benefits Open Enrollment for the 2013 plan year.

5) Kathryn Newcomer, Chair of the Committee on University and Urban Affairs, reported on a project undertaken by members of the GW community who volunteered in a Reading Leaders Pilot Program. This was a very successful partnership between members of the GW community volunteering to participate with the Washington Literacy Center in activities during Adult Literacy Week.

6) Professor Hermann Helgert, Chair of the Physical Facilities Committee, reported on a number of facilities projects underway, including classroom availability and audiovisual and information technology improvements for learning in these spaces. An update was given on current construction projects, including the Science and Engineering Hall, the new building for the School of Public Health and Health Services and the GW Museum (including the associated Conservation Center at the Virginia Science and Technology Campus). The report also discussed the redevelopment of several on-campus townhouses, construction of the Law Learning Center Garage and renovations at Gelman Library, to include reconfiguration of the entrance and housing the Churchill Library. On-campus renovations of Ross Hall, Munson and Lisner Halls, and the Marvin Center were outlined, and future projects, including construction of a new superdorm, a new use for the Hall on Virginia Avenue, and eventual redevelopment of 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue (the Kaiser Building) were also described.
7) Human Resources Vice President Sabrina Ellis reported on the smoke-free campus initiative and indicated she would work with the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students and other relevant Senate and University committees and stakeholders in the development of the roll-out for this program.

8) Dean Michael Feuer of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development reported on the state of the School.

9) Vice President Chalupa presented a report to the Senate on Research.

10) Innovation Task Force Chair David Lawlor reported on the work of the Task Force.

11) Provost Lerman presented his annual report on Core Indicators of Academic Excellence

12) Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion Terri Reed presented the biennial Report on Diversifying the Faculty.

13) Executive Vice President and Treasurer Lou Katz reported on the state of the University’s finances

You can find all these reports on the Senate website.

This report reflects only some of the activities and accomplishments of the members of the Faculty Senate and standing committees. Faculty Senate members have expended a great deal of time and energy on behalf of their colleagues and the entire University. Since the last meeting of the Faculty Assembly, the Faculty Senate and its committees, with your assistance and support, have addressed many matters that are important to the continued academic improvement and the future success of the University. Your active support of and involvement in the work of the Faculty Senate is essential to our success as a faculty community participating in the shared governance of the University. The level of faculty interest and engagement in the work of the Senate has been extremely high, especially now that we have an expanded Senate body. The Faculty Senate is a faculty’s primary vehicle of participation and expression within the University structure of shared governance. In addition, the Faculty Senate is dedicated to protect the rights and privileges of individual faculty members in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization Plan. The Senate has achieved a long and remarkable record of success through the work of generations of faculty colleagues throughout the University.

**MY OWN PERSONAL REFLECTIONS AS SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR:** *Since we have a new Winston Churchill library on campus – a quote from Churchill is calling me befitting this occasion:* “We make a living by what we get, but we make a life by what we give....” in service to others – this is what we do here at GW.
For all the new professors, we welcome you and support your pursuit of excellence in your discipline.

To the tenured faculty in the crowd I send out a simple reminder -- that we have one of the most sacred and privileged jobs. Stretch your ideas and actions. Push the boundaries of the educational experience and your research, demand shared governance and transparency, and expect excellence at this university from yourself, your peers and the administration ... since this is your tenured home.

I have been a faculty member at GW for 25 years. This university is on the move. We can all feel it -- it’s hard to quantify and articulate . . . but we all sense that GW is on the verge of breaking through new barriers, breaking out if its own skin and remolding itself to deliver an education experience that is worthy of the potential of this institution.

With this I end my remarks. I wish all of you a successful, productive, and most of all, a fulfilling academic year.

Respectfully submitted,
Scheherazade S. Rehman, Chair
Faculty Senate Executive Committee