

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

REGULAR FACULTY ASSEMBLY
September 10, 2007
Lisner Auditorium

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman at 3:10 p.m. Vice President Lehman welcomed all of the members of the Assembly and extended a special welcome to the emeriti faculty present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting held on October 16, 2006 were approved as distributed.

NEW FACULTY MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS

Vice President Lehman welcomed faculty members new to the University, and called upon those present by School to introduce themselves to the Assembly, asking that they describe their appointment and say a few words about their interest in scholarship, research, and/or teaching at the University. The last new faculty member to introduce himself as a member of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences faculty in the Department of English was the University's newly-inaugurated President, Steven Knapp, who, following a round of applause, stepped to the podium to preside over the rest of the Assembly meeting.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION FA 07/1, "A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN WITH REGARD TO THE COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY SENATE"

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair, introduced Resolution FA 07/1. Professor Robinson noted that the text of the Resolution, which proposes a change in the language of the *Faculty Code*, was approved at the Faculty Senate at its meeting the previous Friday, September 7, 2007. Resolution 07/1 provides for the addition of a second elected Faculty Senate representative from the School of Public Health and Health Services. This is necessary because, although Senate Executive Committee members from each school serve for one-year terms, they may not succeed themselves more than twice. Elected Senate members serve for two-year terms. The result for a School with only one elected Senate representative would be to deprive that School of representation on the Executive Committee in the third year. Several years ago, a similar situation in the Elliott School of International Affairs was resolved by the addition of a second elected Senate member for that School. By providing for a second elected Senate member for the School of Public Health and Health Services pursuant to Resolution FA 07/1, continuous representation on the Senate Executive Committee would be assured.

Professor Robinson moved the adoption of the Resolution. A vote was taken, and resolution FA 07/1 was adopted by unanimous vote. (Resolution FA 07/1 is attached.)

ANNOUNCEMENT AND PRESENTATION OF THE BENDER TEACHING AWARDS

Vice President Lehman noted with appreciation that the Bender Teaching Awards were established several years ago by the generosity of Morton A. Bender, a friend of the University and an advocate for quality teaching. The following faculty members each received a Bender Teaching Award in the indicated category. The text of the faculty citations also appears below.

Shahrokh Ahmadi
Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering
Innovative Use of Technology

Dr. Shahrokh Ahmadi received his B.S. from Virginia Tech, M.S. from West Virginia University, and Ph.D. from University of Maryland at College Park, all in Electrical and Computer Engineering. He has worked in the industry as senior design and research engineer in the area of wireless spread spectrum communication systems, designing point-to-point communicational links. His professional expertise is in the areas of microelectronics, nanotechnology, optical and ultrasonic sensors, System-on-a-Chip technology, and front-end communicational devices. Dr. Ahmadi joined the GW faculty in 1996 and is an Assistant Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering.

Professor Ahmadi's nomination included high praise from colleagues and students alike. One colleague writes that, "He excels in and out of the class in his care for student learning and welfare. He is one of those faculty members who dedicates his time, on occasion into the late hours of the night, preparing lectures, mentoring students and researching teaching tools and techniques to improve student learning. The fact that he has won the Professor of the Year award in our department every year for the past ten years speaks volumes about what his students think of him as well." A student writes, "Professor Ahmadi...taught us that having knowledge in the various fields of engineering and science will not only make us better engineers but also better individuals who are able to understand the work and efforts of people in other fields." One colleague's comment captures the essence of the many positive comments included in Professor Ahmadi's nomination: "The students in the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department at GW are lucky to have Shahrokh as an instructor, and the faculty members in the department are lucky to have him as a colleague."

Cornelius Bennhold
Department of Physics
General Teaching

Cornelius Bennhold is a professor of physics and chair of the Physics Department at GW. He was educated in Germany, Canada and the United States. Dr. Bennhold's research specialty is theoretical nuclear and particle physics, while his teaching interests are primarily in undergraduate science education. He has developed and implemented novel

teaching methods in large introductory physics classes that further student learning of basic physics principles and enhance their critical thinking and scientific reasoning skills.

Professor Bennhold has had a long and distinguished career at The George Washington University, and comments from his colleagues and students indicate how much he is valued in the Physics Department and across the University. One colleague writes, “From his first lecture here, one could see that Cornelius was exceptional. He spoke with strength, knowledge, clarity, and focus, while being fully engaged with his audience. During his career here, he has worked to refine and share his teaching technique with the same intensity he devoted to his research.”

Another colleague states that, “Professor Bennhold seems to have the knack for knowing just the right combination of challenge and compassion, as well as guidance and independence, to help students achieve and grow to approach their potential.” The same colleague noted that “one of Professor Bennhold’s most revealing evaluations was a student comment intended as a scathing indictment: ‘Professor Bennhold never answers any question. He only responds with another question! Why can’t he just tell us the answer and *teach us* like he is supposed to?’” Of course, there are more plainly positive student comments as well: “Professor Bennhold’s classroom was a place where I felt comfortable asking questions as well as answering questions even if I was not positive of the answer.” Another student commented: “When I was having trouble finishing a problem, he would not simply give me an answer, but would pose a question that guided me to approach the problem in a different way and develop the skills necessary to work out the solution on my own. As a result, I am now a much stronger physics student than I have ever been.”

Frank X. Lee
Physics Department
Innovative Use of Technology

Frank Lee earned his bachelor’s degree from Inner Mongolia University and then his master’s in Physics and his doctorate in Theoretical Nuclear Physics from Ohio University. He taught at the Baotou Iron and Steel University in China and Ohio University before joining The George Washington University faculty in 1998, where he is now an Associate Professor of Physics. Professor Lee’s colleagues and students alike are glowing in their descriptions of his teaching innovations. In letters to the selection committee, Physics Department faculty admire Professor Lee’s web-based, real-time grade reports for individual students and his virtual lab demos, strategically placed throughout his lectures. One colleague writes, “Given Professor Lee’s successful combination of high academic standards, great student enthusiasm, pedagogically proven teaching techniques and innovative technologies, he is one of [the Department’s] most effective and beloved professors.” Another colleague writes that “[Professor Lee] has been on the task year after year with never fading intensity to pursue the latest innovative methodologies and tools in the same courses in the hope of making his lectures more interactive and his course materials more streamlined so that an effective and efficient learning environment is provided for all his students.”

Students also report overwhelmingly positive learning experiences in Professor Lee’s courses. One writes that “[he] loves physics, and it shows. He is enthusiastic, accessible

and engaged. He expects a lot from the students, but he also puts a lot into the course, as he is always prepared and there are always assignments to do that will enrich your learning experience.”

Jean-Francois Thibault
Department of Romance, German, & Slavic Languages & Literatures
General Teaching

Jean-Francois Thibault earned degrees from the Lycée Henri IV and the Sorbonne in Paris. He earned his Ph.D. from the University in Maryland in 1976 and joined the faculty of The George Washington University in 1971, where he has served as Professor of French and Human Sciences since 1994. He is retiring this year.

Professor Thibault’s long and successful career at GW has resulted in more accolades than can possibly be included here. Here are just a few of the numerous comments the selection committee received from both students and faculty: One: “Students emphasize his thorough knowledge of the text (‘He knows every book by heart!’) and his attention to the aesthetic dimension of each word, sentence, and line.” Two: “It is refreshing to have a professor who cares so much for his students.” Three: “Jean-Francois is an exceptional colleague and his conversation is always highly stimulating. His superb command of the French language is unparalleled, and so is his wit.” Four: “He is an expert in French literature and also in his capacity to inspire students to love literature. He is a passionate man who would spend unlimited amounts of time with any student who wanted further elaboration on a text whether they were in his class or not.” Five: “I feel sorry for future classes that will not be able to have Professor Thibault as their instructor.” Six: “His willingness to help his colleagues, especially the younger ones, is a pleasure to observe, and he often goes to the extreme of offering his precious old books or personal documents in a spirit of collegiality that I have rarely encountered during my whole career.” Seven: “ ‘Great teacher!’ and ‘J’adore JFT!’ and similar exclamations are complemented by a suggestion on how to improve his teaching: “ ‘not retire!’ ”

Michael Wenger
Department of Sociology
Part-Time Teaching

Michael Wenger is an Adjunct Professor in the Department of Sociology. He was born in New York City and educated at Queens College of the City University of New York, where he was a leader in the civil rights struggles of the early 1960s. He is Acting Vice President at the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, the nation’s preeminent research and public policy analysis institution focusing on issues of race.

Mr. Wenger has been an extremely valuable asset to The George Washington University since he began teaching here four years ago. As one colleague in the Department of Sociology writes, “he has an easy intellectual lecture style that provides a wealth of factual information on the topic while complementing the factual information with anecdotes from both his personal life and professional experience.” Another colleague who observed one of Mr. Wenger’s class meetings writes, “Mike was expert both at posing key questions and at keeping the ensuing discussion focused...[he] embodies...intellectual vitality and

pedagogical skill in the classroom, responsiveness to and a source of motivation for our students, and demanding expectations. He is a first-rate instructor.” Students are similarly effusive in their praise, writing that “Professor Wenger...created an environment of trust by allowing everyone to speak up and disagree with him; students participated without fear of judgment” and that “he respects every opinion and fosters diversity of thought, something that he pushes his students to do outside the classroom and in their daily lives.” Another student writes, “I do not exaggerate when I state that this class fundamentally changed how I think about race in the United States.”

Phyllis Zhang (not in attendance)
Department of East Asian Languages & Literatures
Full-Time, Non-tenured Teaching

Phyllis Zhang completed her college and M.A. program courses in China. She received a Doctorate of Education in Applied Linguistics from Columbia University and also holds an M.A. in East Asian Languages and Cultures from Columbia. Before joining GW, she taught Chinese at Columbia University, where she served as Director of the Chinese Program and Director of the Columbia in Beijing Summer Program. She currently directs the Chinese Language Program at GW.

Professor Zhang came to GW from a very strong Chinese program and, according to her colleagues and students, has done nothing less than build a very strong program here as well. Here is just some of the praise the selection committee received with her nomination: “What is of note is that Phyllis left the prospering Chinese language program at Columbia to come to us and to join a program dealing with many different kinds of difficulties. She told me she was doing it because she loves to meet challenges and to make a difference...She has been keenly interested in using multimedia approaches to make the language lab experience more effective and more fun at the same time...She also enjoys the respect and trust of the Chinese government and the Chinese embassy in Washington, DC. Last year the government sent one of their very select teachers of Chinese as a foreign language to our department.” One student writes, “No matter how frustrating it gets, coming to one of Professor Zhang’s classes always manages to clarify what can seem to be the impossible and remove any self-doubt.” Another student adds, “Her caring and passion encourage an intellectual atmosphere in which students yearn to perform well not just for a superior grade, but more importantly because they do not want to fall short of Professor Zhang’s high expectations of them.” One sentiment expressed by numerous students is summarized by this comment: “Professor Zhang explicitly encourages a type of environment whereby you are not afraid of making mistakes and not afraid of correction when those mistakes inevitably occur.”

REMARKS BY THE CHAIR OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Professor Lilien F. Robinson presented her report to the Assembly. (The report by Professor Robinson is enclosed and made a part of these minutes.)

REMARKS BY DONALD R. LEHMAN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Executive Vice President Lehman presented his remarks entitled, “An Overview of Academic Year, 2006-07, A Succinct Annual Report.” (Remarks by the Vice President are attached and made a part of these minutes.)

REMARKS BY STEVEN KNAPP, PRESIDENT

President Knapp addressed the Assembly after welcoming new faculty members and members of the Assembly. He also recognized emeritus faculty in attendance at the meeting and added that he was pleased that they could be present. (President Knapp’s remarks are attached and made a part of these minutes.)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Assembly, President Knapp adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m. after inviting everyone to the reception immediately following in the Continental Ballroom.

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Secretary

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN WITH REGARD TO THE COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY SENATE (FA 07/1)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
August 24, 2007

Adopted by the Faculty Assembly, September 10, 2007

THE WORDING OF THE AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY FA 07/1 IS IDENTICAL TO THAT PROPOSED BY SENATE RESOLUTION 07/2, TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2007 MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

University Faculty Assembly

10 September 2007
3:00 to 5:00 p.m.
Lisner Auditorium
730 21st Street NW

Remarks by

Donald R. Lehman
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
and
George Gamow Professor of Theoretical Physics

**An Overview of Academic Year 2006-07:
A Succinct Annual Report**

Welcome:

Good afternoon and welcome to our First Faculty Assembly under the leadership of our new President, Steven Knapp. I hope all of you had a rejuvenating, while at the same time productive, summer. No matter the nature of your summer, it is a change of pace from the normal academic year with a different balance of teaching, research and scholarship, and service-related activities. As it ends, the stage is set to welcome our new and returning students, undergraduate and graduate. The hard work of learning more, conveying more, and assessing the results of our efforts are once again upon us. This cycle of renewal – the fresh start each year – makes being at a University a precious and privileged opportunity as a lifetime of endeavor. To all our new faculty colleagues introduced here today, and to those currently in the classroom teaching, I hope you find your new undertaking at GW as rewarding and as stimulating as I have over my many years here. Finally, to President Knapp, welcome to GW – it is a unique place with so much to offer and so much room to grow under your leadership.

The nature of my remarks:

Each year, I consider it a great honor and privilege to address the Faculty Assembly. It gives me the opportunity to talk about specific academic issues or about happenings in Academic Affairs that are of importance to all of us as members of the faculties of the University's colleges and schools. This year, for the first time, I am going to give you a broad overview of some of the things that took place in our colleges and schools and across the University as a whole in the academic realm. I am able to do this thanks to the excellent annual reports the deans and other senior academic administrators prepare for me each year. These annual reports convey the major accomplishments for the past year, major obstacles to progress in the past year, and major goals for the coming year. The key in preparing these reports is to connect accomplishments and goals to the metrics of the University's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence. So, in some ways, this is a University-level Academic Affairs Annual Report, albeit a very succinct one. I am sure the deans and other senior academic administrators agree with me that neither they nor I would have anything about which to report if it weren't for the faculties' efforts and commitments to achieving our common academic goals by working collaboratively together. It is through these accomplishments that the stage is set for the following year's goals and objectives.

I shall begin by giving brief remarks about major accomplishments in each of our nine colleges and schools followed by some that are at the University-wide level. I emphasize that there are many accomplishments about which I could have spoken. My selectivity is simply for the purpose of giving you the flavor of what is happening in the colleges and schools. Your choices may have been completely different from my own.

CCAS:

In a college as comprehensive as Arts and Sciences, it is difficult to choose any one item or one department on which to focus, because so many outstanding things occur across

the College in one academic year. For that reason, I shall convey aspects of the broader picture at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, respectively. From the viewpoint of the University's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, this limitation in coverage on my part pertains primarily to our goal of moving GW into the ranks of the first-tier institutions through quality undergraduate education and selected top-ranked graduate programs, especially at the doctoral level.

The CCAS Undergraduate Studies Office continues to work towards a comprehensive first-year program. During the past academic year, the College offered 49 Dean's Seminars for 980 freshmen. Full-time faculty taught all these seminars; many were among the senior faculty who produce significant research and scholarship. Evaluations of these seminars indicate that they continue to engage and academically challenge our students. Moving beyond freshmen, two Dean's Scholars Programs, each structured as a Living and Learning community, continue to thrive. Within the Dean's Scholar Program in Globalization, there are currently two cohorts, one studying Global Health and the other studying Global Migration. A third cohort focused on Media and Globalization is getting started. These cohorts work with students at the University of Chile and the National University of Singapore. Locally, there is a Dean's Scholars Program in Shakespeare. This program was new in AY 2006-07: Students take some classes together and participate in local activities focused on Shakespeare. These efforts, along with others such as cooperative academic programming with GW Housing, all address our aim of providing a quality undergraduate experience for our students.

Graduate admissions in CCAS continue to increase in their selectivity especially in doctoral programs, where maximum and minimum GRE (Graduate Record Examinations) scores continue to increase. In 2003-04, our average maximum GRE percentile for doctoral applicants was 78.1. This past year it was 84. In 2003-04, our average minimum percentile score was 46.7, which rose to 61.3 this past year. There appears to be a leveling off of the average maximum GRE scores for master's students [2003-04 was 62nd percentile compared to the 76th percentile this past year], though higher admissions standards are evident across the board in minimum GRE scores [2003-04 was 35.2 compared to 58.7 this past year]. Evidence seems to be mounting that we are facing stiffer competition for the top master's candidates because our competitors appear to be offering funding packages to attract academically strong master's applicants.

These accomplishments during AY 2006-07 lead naturally into a major review of the undergraduate curriculum and careful follow up on the progress being made on the implementation of Ph.D. programs' three-year plans that evolved from the University's review of doctoral programs.

ESIA:

In many ways, the Elliott School of International Affairs is closely linked to the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, whether it has to do with the education of undergraduate and graduate students or the roles of the faculty members who cross the boundaries of the two schools. Yet, the Elliott School stands out as a major component

of the University through its external recognition as an outstanding school of international affairs. This standing has been reaffirmed through a survey of political scientists, which was circulated on the internet and published in the March-April 2007 issue of *Foreign Policy* magazine. The Elliott School's master's programs were ranked #7 through a survey that asked respondents to identify the five best master's programs in international relations for students who seek a policy career. In another component of the survey, where respondents were asked to identify the five best colleges or universities for undergraduate students who want to study international relations, GW's program was ranked #10. Only five universities – Columbia, GW, Georgetown, Harvard, and Princeton – were ranked in the top ten in both categories. Certainly, a significant part of this recognition occurs because of the productivity of the faculty members associated with ESIA.

Careful and continuous academic advising is an important path to a quality undergraduate education. In this regard, the advising office within ESIA continues to show great and increasing strength. New programs have been added that include sessions devoted to selecting academic concentrations, as well as sessions on preparing for graduate and professional school. The student peer advising service has been enhanced with a new instant messaging service with emphasis on students who are studying overseas. These and other technology-related enhancements continue to improve advising within ESIA.

At the graduate level, the ESIA faculty members laid the groundwork for a newly approved M.A. program in Middle East Studies that starts this fall. Student recruitment and faculty recruitment began immediately upon approval from the Board of Trustees for the new degree. More than 100 individuals applied and four new faculty members focused on Middle East Studies were hired through national searches. Professor Nathan Brown has assumed the directorship of the program and through collaborative work with other faculty members developed the curriculum for the degree. This may turn out to be one of the most important accomplishments for ESIA in 2006-07 owing to its relevance and GW's capabilities in this area.

GWSB:

The new facilities in which the School of Business resides have provided an environment that is dynamic and productive for special events, developing new partnerships, and for attracting business leaders from around the world. Within this new environment, the Business School focused on career guidance for its students, both undergraduate and graduate, and on research by opening two new institutes under the University's signature program initiatives.

Obviously, career services play a critical role in business schools. Placements of our graduates form the external perception of the quality of our educational programs. Placements are closely monitored by bodies that rank business schools and their rankings, in turn, influence prospective students in their selection of where to attend business school. At the beginning of AY 2006-07, the F. David Fowler Graduate Career Center was merged with the newly created GWSB Undergraduate Career Center. We already

know that the delivery of services was improved significantly based on anecdotal and survey feedback. These improvements came about because the requests of students were heard. An external indicator of this improvement comes from the scores that our students gave to career services in the 2007 *Business Week* ranking of undergraduate business programs. Demand for face-to-face advising appointments continues to grow. We will need to expand our capacity to handle it.

This past year, two of the GWSB's most exciting, new entities received signature program funding under the special endowment funding for the University's Strategic Plan: The Institute for Integrating Statistics in Decision Sciences and The Institute for Corporate Responsibility. The Decision Sciences Institute fosters the integration of modern statistical methods into the decision sciences with emphasis on Bayesian thinking, utility assessment, and probability assessment. This Institute collaborates with the Department of Statistics in CCAS and the Department of Engineering Management and Systems Engineering in SEAS. Already the faculty members of the Institute are pursuing external funding from the National Science Foundation and have launched a technical report series and a seminar series, as well as initiating summer research grants for faculty members. The second new entity, the Institute for Corporate Responsibility, seeks to foster research, education, and outreach on the topic of corporate responsibility. This Institute has four areas of focus: Business Ethics/Peace through Commerce, Environmental Sustainability, Corporate Governance, and Global Stakeholders Strategies. During its first year, the Institute held a number of conferences and seminars among which were a Teaching Business Ethics Seminar, Peace through Commerce Conference, and an Implementing Solutions to Climate Crises Conference. Such effort by the faculty members of the School of Business addresses our University goal to move GW into the ranks of top-tier research institutions through faculty research and scholarship growth.

SEAS:

Partnerships within and outside of GW are many times the way we achieve things programmatically that otherwise would not be achievable. For example, within, SEAS students pursuing either a B.A. or B.S. degree with a major in any SEAS program now may choose a new concentration in general business offered by GW's Business School. Such a concentration is equivalent to a second major. Outside of GW, for example, the SEAS's Computer Science Department developed an important partnership with the Integrated Justice Information Systems (IJIS) Institute to introduce a new graduate certificate and degree concentration that combines information technology with the needs of data sharing, interoperability, data management, and security in the field of law enforcement and justice. The IJIS Institute is a non-profit corporation that comprises approximately 180 technology companies involved in the development and implementation of justice information systems. The closeness of this collaboration is exemplified by IJIS renting space from GW at the VA Campus for its operations. The 15-credit graduate certificate program was launched in January 2007 both in Foggy Bottom and at the VA Campus.

Similarly to the GWSB, the SEAS had two of its initiatives chosen for funding under the special endowment payout funding for the University's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence: The Center for Biomimetics and Bioinspired Engineering, now known as COBRE, and The Institute for Massively Parallel Applications and Computing Technologies, known as IMPACT.

COBRE faculty members focus on interdisciplinary research and education in the area of biomimetic (think "mimic") and bioinspired engineering. Those who work in these areas attempt to create an approach to transfer or extract from nature technologies, design principles, and solutions into our own designs for small, multi-functional machines, technologies, and devices. Rajat Mittal, a professor from the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, is the director of the Center. In turn, the IMPACT team is lead by Professor Tarek El-Ghazawi, from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering. Faculty members and students involved in this interdisciplinary work focus on what is called high-performance computing, which refers to the application of supercomputers in various fields including the search for new technologies to develop better supercomputers. Through a partnership with IMPACT, the National Science Foundation (NSF) awarded GW funding to create an NSF Industry/University Center, named the National Science Foundation Center for High-Performance Reconfigurable Computing (CHREC). This activity will be located at the University's VA Campus.

GSEHD:

Accreditation of a school of education with respect to teacher education is critical owing to the expectations of counties and states with regard to the qualifications of teachers they hire. The George Washington University community can be proud of the faculty members in our own School of Education in that they have maintained their accreditation continuously since 1954 – more than fifty years. Once again, in 2006, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accredited GSEHD programs in teacher preparation, school counseling, and educational administration following a rigorous review. In addition and as part of the NCATE review, 13 of our accredited programs were nationally recognized by specialized professional associations aligned with NCATE.

The Graduate School of Education's Graduate Program in Professional Teaching Standards, the only one of its kind in the Washington Metropolitan area, continues to support teacher candidates for National Board Certification. The School collaborates with the Montgomery County Public Schools and the Montgomery County teachers' union to offer the certificate, and in its first year, more than 150 teachers participated. A similar program has supported teacher candidates for National Board certification in Anne Arundel County Public Schools in Maryland for five years. The program is being extended to Prince George's Public Schools as well. Within DC, the DC Public Schools has committed funding to GSEHD to continue support work with their teachers as candidates for 2006-07 certification of the National Board. Last year, twelve teachers from DC's School Without Walls participated in a preliminary support initiative to determine their interest in becoming Board candidates.

While educating our nation's future teachers is the core mission of GSEHD, that is not all of what keeps the school's faculty members very busy. During the past academic year, GSEHD faculty members completed a total of 19 books, 73 refereed journal articles, 20 book chapters and 11 monographs. Making much of this work possible were externally funded research expenditures for the past academic year of approximately \$16M.

Law:

It is very difficult to speak about the Law School without starting off saying something about the quality of the entering J.D. students. Last year's class was academically the strongest class ever admitted to GW. The class numbered 550 students with 424 in the full-time division and 126 in the part-time division. Forty-two percent of the class is women and twenty-five percent is minorities. Compared to the fall 2005 class, the median GPA of the class rose from 3.59 to 3.62, while the median LSAT score remained at the School's record high of 165. The class includes many students from some of the most selective undergraduate institutions in the country.

Enrollment remained stable in post-J.D. (LL.M.) programs. The School received 724 applications (up 5% compared to the previous year), accepted 437 applicants, and enrolled 178 students. The post-J.D. program includes 85 foreign attorneys and 93 U.S. attorneys. Such programs are focused on Environmental Law, Government Procurement, Intellectual Property, International, Litigation and Dispute Resolution, and General.

Students are attracted to law schools because of the faculty members and what they do. In the realm of scholarship, GW's Law faculty members are remarkably productive. During the 2006-07 academic year, Dean Lawrence tells me, that at a minimum, the Law School faculty published 34 books or book supplements, 89 law review articles or book chapters, 8 book reviews, and more than 40 newspaper or similar articles. The recently initiated Social Science Research Network law school ranking metrics, while imperfect, gives some indication of the standing of this scholarship. GW Law School ranked 7th in the number of authors, 9th in the total of downloads, and 13th in the total number of papers posted.

CPS:

The College of Professional Studies has as a significant part of its mission continuing to grow enrollments through increased enrollments in existing off-campus educational programs and through the creation of new programs. Predominantly, these programs are post-baccalaureate, professional education. One component of this effort is the expansion of distance-learning opportunities.

Increasing enrollments in existing off-campus educational programs primarily means working collaboratively with the faculties of the schools offering such programs. Currently, those schools are CCAS, GWSB, SEAS, and GSEHD. These programs are offered at our educational centers located in Arlington, Alexandria, and Hampton Roads,

the VA Campus, and on-site at schools or corporate facilities. This past year was the first year that the College of Professional Studies has been responsible for the management and marketing of programs at the VA Campus similar to what it does at the other educational centers. The most significant impact on this effort occurred in engineering programs, where the number of credit hours taken increased by 14% (255 credit hours) over the previous year. Through the efforts of GSEHD faculty members and Paula Harper, who is the CPS lead person at the VA Campus, a grant has been received from Wachovia for ESL/Special Education teacher training, and grants are pending with the NSF and the Loudoun English Acquisition Project for programs offered by GSEHD.

The College of Professional Studies has its own degree programs in professional studies specialties at the associate-, baccalaureate-, and master's-degree levels in addition to undergraduate and graduate certificate offerings. Examples of these CPS programs are Police Science, Publishing, and Landscape Design. The Police Science program awarded its first three bachelor's degrees this past year. These three students joined 31 of their colleagues who received undergraduate certificates in Police Science, 14 students who completed Master of Professional Studies degrees, and 40 students who completed Graduate Certificates in Professional Studies. Total revenue for CPS programs was \$2.4M, which was \$1M greater than in FY 06.

The progress that has been made within CPS through development of its own programs continues. This past year we saw the launch of a new graduate certificate and a master's degree in Paralegal Studies, in association with the Law School, and the creation of two new master's degrees for launch this year in Sustainable Landscape Design and Strategic Public Relations. As you can guess, there are other programs being moved to the "launch pad," some of which will be distance versions of existing programs.

SPHHS:

The past academic year marked the 10th year since the founding of the School of Public Health and Health Services. When I reflect on those ten years of progress, it is truly remarkable what has been accomplished in such a short time period for a major school of The George Washington University.

Academic year 2006-07 was no exception to continued progress. The faculty of the school completed all but one of its searches for permanent department chairs. That means all but one of its seven departments now have permanent chairs in place. In addition, two new administrative positions were created within SPHHS – Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs and Director of the Practicum Program, a new undertaking at the School that is placing some 300 master's students in the field. Overall, 16 individuals joined the faculty in various ranks this past year. With focus on developing a diverse faculty, the faculty now has a racial and ethnic minority component of 17.1%, which represents an increase of more than 50% over the last two years.

The faculty of SPHHS recruited a class that is academically strong and geographically diverse – the latter representing a growing trend. Increasingly, SPHHS is the top choice

among public health school applicants. Nevertheless, the School increasingly is losing applicants to our competitors because of their offering more competitive financial aid packages. As I mentioned above for CCAS, this appears to be an issue that we at GW must consider carefully in light of our goal to have selected top-ranked graduate programs.

There has also been significant growth of externally funded research within SPHHS. This comes about largely through the accomplishments of faculty members in publishing in many of the leading health and medical journals. The faculty's success in this realm partially derives from their partnerships with government, not-for-profits, and industry. One of the strongest of these relationships is with the DC Government's Department of Health, particularly with respect to the city's Medicaid and HIV/AIDS programs.

SMHS:

I don't think that anyone would question that the School of Medicine and Health Sciences had a very productive year during AY 2006-07. The key to this success derives from the clear connectivity developed for the School through its location in the Washington Metro area. It sets the base for faculty members, residents, and students to participate in broader discussions about health on a national and global level. When this is coupled with the presence of the School of Public Health and Health Services, as well as all of the major national and international organizations involved with health, it is a win-win situation from all directions. We all believe this has translated into extraordinary admissions numbers and programs that have changed the nature of the students and residents attracted to GW.

The two-year-old Office of Student Opportunities plays a major role in making the opportunities just mentioned a reality. It coordinates opportunities for SMHS students to take advantage of the School's unique location and partnerships. The OSO has taken shape as a center of excellence in education through the existence of seven tracks of possible study for medical students: bioethics, community health, emergency preparedness, global health, health policy, medical education, and research. More than half of the classes of 2009 and 2010 are participating in track programs. Over one hundred students have been involved in summer internships that include domestic and international placements for experiential learning. The summer opportunities for internships included the World Health Organization in Geneva, the Office of the U.S. Surgeon General, the Peace Corps, and others.

Our School of Medicine does not only educate medical doctors. There exist a plethora of health sciences programs under the very able leadership of Jean Johnson, Senior Associate Dean for Health Sciences. For example, the Physician Assistant program continues to be ranked as one of the top four programs in the country. The new nursing program is ranked 63rd out of 300 schools just after three years. The Physical Therapy program saw applications increase from 52 last year to 205 this year. The new spirituality certificate program, in coordination with the GW Institute for Spirituality and Health, had 25 students enrolled in their first offering which is a very strong start. The

Pharmacogenomics program, in cooperation with Shenandoah University at the VA Campus, doubled its admission with 14 new students this past fall.

University-wide:

Now that we have a snapshot of the accomplishments this past year in each of the schools, let me give you some major University-level items of note in research, graduate studies, academic technologies, and the Gelman Library System.

Research:

The primary measure of externally funded research activity is expenditures. Research expenditures increased to \$142M in FY 07, representing an increase of approximately 8% over the FY 06 total of \$132M. Relative to FY 05, when expenditures were \$119M, research expenditures across the University increased by about 20% in two years. Part of this success is driven by a 9% increase in the number of proposals submitted for external funding – 871 in FY 07 compared to 797 in FY 06. These outcomes reflect the significant efforts of our faculties, research staff, and research administrators during what certainly has been a period of challenge and opportunity.

Graduate Studies:

Outside the Medical Center and Law School, a record amount of graduate-student funding was allocated -- \$19,962,955. In addition, graduate-student support packages were analyzed to determine their competitiveness. As a result of this analysis, a plan was developed and implemented to raise the minimum packages (stipend plus salary if a GTA, GRA, or GAA) to \$16,000 for master's level students and \$18,000 for doctoral-level students. Though the additional funds have been allocated to accomplish these more competitive packages, more support packages are needed at both the master's and doctoral level.

Academic Technologies:

In August 2006, GW was accepted as a partner university in Apple Computer's iTunes University. This partnership, supported by strategic initiative funds provided by my office through the special endowment payout for signature initiatives, enabled Academic Technologies to launch *Colonial Cast*, GW's academic podcasting initiative. The growth of *Colonial Cast* has significantly exceeded expectations. From the seven courses that participated in the pilot project in the Fall of 2006, yielding 86 file uploads by faculty and 1,086 downloads by students, the program grew in the Spring of 2007 to 28 courses yielding 311 uploads by faculty members and 5,954 downloads by students. Already, one program is creating video podcasts of all of its course lectures, and all of the Summer Distance Learning Initiative courses have been uploaded into iTunes University resulting in enhanced content access for students and substantial storage savings for GW.

Gelman Library System:

The Gelman Library System staff raised the quality and strength of several collections that support signature programs associated with global development and international relations. Factors that made this possible include a gift of \$100K from the government of Taiwan to staff and operate the Taiwan Resource Center; a \$91K grant to support the China Documentation Center; and the acquisition of two major collections of broad and historical significance – the PNC/Riggs Bank Archive and the Jack Anderson papers. To further support academic excellence, the Gelman System staff put into place a strategy to open the Global Resource Center, a unique collection of multi-disciplinary resources that focus on and promote interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty members.

Closing:

There you have it! A succinct annual report on the extensive happenings associated with our academic enterprise within the colleges and schools and at the level of the University as a whole. The commitment of the members of our faculties across the University makes this all possible.

The stage is set for the current academic year. I expect this to be a year of renewed commitment to the University's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence. This commitment will find its motivation through the Middle States decennial review of our current self-study that is focused on progress made toward achieving the goals of the Strategic Plan. In addition, I expect new foci within this framework to be developed under President Knapp's leadership that energize us in our teaching and learning, research and scholarship, and service to the external community. Certainly, as you can extract from my remarks, we all need to bring energy and focus to raising the funding necessary to realize our goals and objectives. Such effort will occur through strategic planning and goal setting for fund raising by the Development Office with the deans and others under the President's leadership. Faculty members will obviously play a role as they are called upon by their deans. Separate from this, however, I ask the members of the faculties to work with us to generate new revenues through increased enrollments in academic programs where appropriate and possible, and through the development of new academic programs within the schools and colleges or through CPS. In these ways, and through continued pursuit by the members of the faculties of external funding for their research and scholarship work, we shall be able to better support our students, to better provide the resources they and we need to carry out our efforts to create new knowledge, and to better achieve the goals we have set for ourselves.

Thank you and my best wishes for a great academic year!

Address to the Faculty Assembly
Steven Knapp, President
The George Washington University
September 10, 2007

I have had the privilege already of interacting with many of you. But for many weeks now, as one of the newest members of the faculty of The George Washington University, I have been looking forward to an opportunity to address my new colleagues as a body. It's a pleasure to stand before you at last.

Last week I gave a speech at Opening Convocation that *The Hatchet* later dubbed a "history lesson." As often happens with journalistic headlines, I could not tell whether this was meant as a compliment or an insult. In any event, I was glad to see that a number of you were there to greet our new students, but of course the speech was aimed at the students and their families. I know better than to lecture faculty, unless of course I am giving a lecture in my own field and by the invitation of my colleagues. If I use historical examples this afternoon, I will be doing so to illustrate a point and not under any illusion that I know as much as, let alone more than, you do about the University that I am both humbled and honored to lead.

Very soon after my appointment was announced last winter, planning was already underway for my inauguration as your 16th president—which, by coincidence, will take place on the 16th of November! Someone called to ask if there were any themes I might be planning to highlight. Without hesitation, I quickly listed three: first, the relation of GW to the District of Columbia and to the broader capital region; second, our aspirations to increase our visibility and impact as a research university; third, our need to strengthen our base of support among our alumni by deepening their sense of belonging to GW as a lifelong and worldwide community.

Those three themes were so easy to name because they so clearly define the nature of my job as I have understood it ever since I was first contacted by the presidential search committee—an understanding that has been confirmed by the numerous conversations I have had since then with trustees, alumni, the deans, and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, as well as by the e-mails and letters I have received from many of you. But none of the goals they entail—literally not a single one—is achievable without your support, your advice, and your direct engagement in our common effort. That's not an attempt at collective flattery; it's simply true. It's the main thing I wanted to say to you on this, my earliest opportunity to address you. The rest will be, as I suggested a moment ago, illustrative. My examples are selected more or less at random and are not intended to be in any way comprehensive; again, you know much more about all these topics than I do, although I'm learning!

Let me begin, then, with the first of the three themes I mentioned: our partnerships with institutions and agencies here in Washington and in the larger capital region. Last week, I had an opportunity to tour the Folger Shakespeare Library with its director, Gail Kern Paster, who also happens to be a former member of my new department. I learned about a

course for GW undergraduates who will each be assigned a rare Renaissance-era book, which he or she will spend the semester studying in all its aspects, material as well as cultural and historical.

When I meet with city officials, from the Mayor on down, I am continually reminded of the partnerships between our Graduate School of Education and Human Development and the city's public schools. The health of the public schools is, of course, an issue of existential importance, both for the District and for this university, whose fate is intimately connected to that of the city that is its home. City officials also point to Professor Sara Rosenbaum of our School of Public Health and Health Services, who is leading a partnership with the D.C. Department of Health. But of course our partners are everywhere in this city and its suburbs, engaging every one of our schools and departments. They include (and this selection is truly random):

**the Shakespeare Theatre;
the National Trust for Historic Preservation;
the DC Water Resource Research Center;
the Food and Drug Administration;
the National Institutes of Health;
the FBI;
the Department of State;
the Drug Enforcement Administration;
the Defense Criminal Investigative Services;
the Department of Homeland Security;
the National Zoo;
National Air and Space Museum;
Montgomery County Schools; and
the Federal Forecasters Consortium.**

Our partnerships are so many and so various, in fact, that one of our greatest institutional challenges is finding ways to quantify their impact and convey it to the many public and private audiences that, right now, fail to appreciate the magnitude of that impact or its importance to the District, the nation, and the broader global community.

The question of impact brings me to the second theme I mentioned: research. Part of my task will be to explain to our many constituencies (not of course to you, who already know) the many truths about research that are so widely ignored or misunderstood:

First, that research enhances rather than detracts from teaching. Nothing contributes to excellence in teaching more than the excitement of intellectual engagement at the frontiers of the discipline in question. In that connection, I was glad to read the resolution the Faculty Senate adopted last Friday to begin a review of the undergraduate curriculum across the five schools in which undergraduates are enrolled. That should provide an opportunity, among other things, to explore innovative ways of designing courses and programs that will increase the complementarity of research and instruction.

Another truth is that research occurs across all disciplines, not just in those that operate in physical laboratories. Still another is that research is not a “cash cow” for universities; in fact, sponsorship for research from federal and even more from private sources rarely if ever covers the full cost of the activity it’s intended to support. That’s one reason why universities set up centers and institutes that can attract support from multiple sources. It’s also, together with financial aid for students, the main reason why presidents and deans spend so much of their time persuading prospective donors that this is one of the most exciting and rewarding places to spend their philanthropic dollars.

And, in fact, research at GW should not be a hard sell. This faculty is distinguished by a history of research accomplishments that will be matched and even exceeded, I am confident, by the achievements of its future. Here again, my examples are random and could easily be multiplied:

In 1955, the Nobel Prize in Chemistry was awarded to Vincent du Vigneaud for what the citation called “his work on biochemically important sulfur compounds, especially for the first synthesis of a polypeptide hormone”—work he had done at GW in the 1930s.

In 1970, the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine was shared by GW lecturer Julius Axelrod for his work on humoral transmitters.

Samuel Flagg Bemis, chair of our History Department, won the Pulitzer Prize in 1926 for that year’s best book in American history.

Physicist George Gamow (whose name was given to the chair now occupied, as you know, by Dr. Lehman) worked here from 1934 to 1956; early on he predicted the theory of the “genetic code” (later confirmed by DNA studies) and the “big bang theory” (later confirmed by scientists at Bell Labs). Edward Teller was also on our faculty for part of that same period, from 1935 to 1945.

The entire field of public contract law was essentially invented by two GW professors, John Cibinic and Ralph Nash. And the history of medicine in the last century was significantly shaped by faculty in our Medical Center, including Major Walter Reed, who identified the mosquito as the carrier of yellow fever, and Dr. Frederick Russell who introduced the typhoid vaccine to the United States Army.

Those efforts, of course, were in the fairly distant past. A list of current examples would no doubt include:

Chemistry Professor Akos Vertes, who is developing a microscope that will enable researchers to see for the first time how proteins interact with living tissue;

Peter Hotez, who is working on a vaccine for hookworm, a parasitic disease affecting one in eight people in the world;

Gene Cohen, a pioneer in the field of aging, who is uncovering important links between creative pursuits and mental agility;

Liliana Florea, who received the 2006 Sloan Research Fellowship for her work on computational techniques for solving biological and medical problems;

Bernard Wood, University Professor of Human Origins, internationally recognized for his work in paleoanthropology; and

our newest University Professor, Dr. Vanessa Gamble, a renowned scholar in medical humanities, who brings with her a body of work on racial disparities in health care and bioethics.

One of the great pleasures of joining a new institution is learning about faculty achievements like the ones I just sampled. Another is finding out about new ideas and initiatives that are just emerging from the energy and imagination of one's colleagues. Those I've encountered so far reflect an astonishing array of departments and programs—an array made more complex and difficult to sample by the fact that many of the newer areas involve the intersection of multiple disciplines. I'll simply note some of the new and growing subject areas under which these innovations fall:

**remote sensing;
nanotechnology;
energy and fuel technologies;
addiction and substance abuse;
aging and neurodegenerative diseases;
the development of innovative curricula for teaching math and science; and
the international and cultural dimensions of homeland security.**

These are not my ideas, but things I've read and heard that you are interested in. The last thing I want to do as President is tell you, my colleagues, what interests you ought to have! My job is to understand what interests you, and why, so I can remove any roadblocks to your pursuing those interests; and also so I can convey to potential partners and supporters the impact that your doing so is likely to have. Together, we can build the pre-eminence in research that GW aspires and deserves to enjoy.

The third theme I mentioned was our need to strengthen a sense among alumni—starting, in fact, from their earliest days as pre-alumni or, in other words, students!—that GW really is a lifelong and worldwide community that can open doors for them throughout their lives and that provides their most important means of enjoying—once again, throughout their lives—the rich and exciting worlds of knowledge and intellect. I have already heard from many alumni who seek a deeper and stronger connection with what is traditionally called their alma mater, but what I would prefer to call, simply, their university.

If I learned anything in my administrative roles at my former institution, it was how eager alumni were to reconnect, not so much with the university as an abstract entity, but with faculty in particular. The most interesting and enjoyable events I participated in over the course of 13 years in two extended fund-raising campaigns were those in which I witnessed that reconnection: events in which alumni once again experienced what it had been like to participate in some measure in the intellectual adventure of faculty who were advancing the frontiers of their disciplines. I look forward to repeating those experiences here, in the company of many in this room.

To this point, I have focused on the strengths of this University, actual and potential. That focus reflects my sense of the great privilege that I have been granted to lead this institution into the next phase of its distinguished history. It does not mean, however, that I wish in any way to ignore or to downplay the challenges we face. Our financial resources and, particularly for scientific and technological fields, our facilities are currently inadequate to support the aspirations that I have described and that I am utterly committed to achieving. In many fields, our faculty salaries are lower than they need to be if we are to compete effectively with what the current jargon would term our “aspirational peers.” Our efforts to recruit the best young minds in each of our fields face a significant challenge in the cost of housing. And we suffer from the lingering prejudice that the nation’s capital, because it is the seat of national power, is not the center of culture and intellect that you and I know it to be—not least because of this great University that lies at its heart! Those challenges remain despite the remarkable progress that occurred under the leadership of my predecessors. And they remain despite the many successes that you have had in garnering external support and gaining visibility for your vitally important work.

I would not have taken this job if I thought those challenges were insurmountable. I look forward to taking them on—as I can only do, once again, with your advice and support. Thank you.

REPORT TO THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
September 10, 2007

Let me first extend a warm welcome to President Knapp, our new colleagues, and all of the members of the Faculty Assembly as we begin a new academic year. I am confident that it will be an exciting and productive year for an energized and enthusiastic faculty. As it is customary at the annual meeting of the Faculty Assembly, I offer the following report on the Faculty Senate's recent activities.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

During the 2006-2007 session the Faculty Senate considered six resolutions. Two were adopted without emendation; three were adopted as amended, and one was not adopted. President Trachtenberg, on behalf of the administration accepted one resolution, "noted" one resolution, "acknowledged" one resolution, characterized one resolution as "inform[ing] administrative thinking" but "not binding," and declined comment on two resolutions.

Proposed by standing and special 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. However, all of the resolutions as well as the administration's response will be attached to this report.

"A Resolution on Construction of New Academic Facilities"

This resolution was introduced by the Committee on Physical Facilities. Pursuant to the Committee's extensive study of the programmatic needs, as presented by the Deans of the Schools, it addresses and makes recommendations with respect to future construction of academic facilities.

Passed by the Faculty Senate, the resolution endorses investment in new facilities for the School of Engineering and Applied Science identifying it as a priority second to the construction of the Science Center. On the University side, it identifies the Graduate School of Education and Human Development and on the Medical side, the School of Public Health and Health Services as the next priorities.

"A Resolution on the Timetable for Action on the Recommendations of the Joint Administration/Faculty Task Force on a possible Four-Course, Four-Credit Undergraduate Curricular Structure"

This resolution was presented by the Faculty Senate's Special Committee on the Proposed 4x4 Curriculum report.

It provides for an extension of the administration's two-month timetable for faculty

response to the report of the Joint Task Force on the 4x4 curriculum. It points out that in view of the potentially profound and wide sweeping consequences of adopting the recommendations of the Joint Task Force, the report requires serious consideration. Further, it stresses that this could not be accomplished in two months with respect to a report produced after eighteen months of deliberation.

The resolution establishes a deadline for the Schools' and the Faculty Senate's response to the Joint Task Force Report of one week prior to the April 13, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting.

The resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate (and followed by the administration).

“Substitute Resolution Regarding Recommendations in the Report of the Joint Administration/Faculty Task Force on a Possible Four-Course, Four-Credit Undergraduate Curriculum Structure”

This resolution was proposed by the Faculty Senate's Special Committee which had been established by the Executive Committee to receive and evaluate the Joint Administration/Faculty Task Force Report on a 4x4 undergraduate curriculum structure.

The Senate resolution points to major flaws in the report's proposed 4x4 curriculum model, a substantial weakening of the breadth of academic programs, lack of evidence supporting the academic and economic benefits of a 4 x4 curriculum, and inadequate justification for its adoption at George Washington University. Accordingly, the resolution recommends to the faculties of the schools that the report's proposed 4x4 curriculum model 'scenario' not be adopted at this time.

It urges the schools to undertake curriculum reviews in collaboration with the incoming administration of President Knapp.

The resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate.

“A Resolution on Library Endowment Funds”

Presented by the Libraries Committee, the resolution addressed the collections budget of the Gelman Library System. It recommends that the University Administration request that the University Librarian, in consultation with the Committee on Libraries and the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, provide a plan that will bring the collections budget to a level equal to the average level of collections expenditures of “market basket” schools.

It recommends that the University Administration raise to “university-level” status its fund raising efforts for the Gelman Library System.

The Senate passed this resolution.

REPORTS

The Faculty Senate received ten reports on a wide range of subjects, including: the College of Professional Studies, strategic plan on research, financial aspects of the University's sponsored research, the composition of the faculty, recent building and renovation activity on campus, update on classroom scheduling/availability, emergency preparedness, and campus security.

The Senate also received presentations from the Deans of the School of Public Health and Health Services, the Elliott School of International Affairs, and the Law School.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Tenure Revocation

As required by the Faculty Code, a tenure revocation case in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences was heard by a Hearing Committee of the Faculty Senate's Dispute Resolution Committee. The Committee supported the revocation of tenure. The Dispute Resolution Committee also heard an appeal in this case, upholding the decision of the Hearing Committee.

Grievances

There are two grievances in process, one in Columbian College and one in the School of Engineering and Applied Science. The first is on appeal and in the second case the parties have agreed to mediation.

Nonconcurrences

No administration nonconcurrences with faculty personnel recommendations were received during the 2006-2007 session.

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.

Despite challenges, 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.

RESOLUTIONS 2006-07 SESSION

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

RESOLUTIONS 2006-07 SESSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Defeated, May 12, 2006

RATIONALE and HISTORY

The Inadequacies of the Current Representation

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

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

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

Student Support

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

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

Student Trustees at Comparable Universities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Adopted November 10, 2006

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Adopted November 10, 2006

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That solely on the basis of programmatic needs:

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

¹ present working name is Science and Engineering Complex

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

Physical Facilities Committee
November 27, 2006

Adopted as twice amended, December 8, 2006

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Adopted, as amended, February 16, 2007

APPENDIX A

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

Report to the Faculty Senate

February 16, 2007

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Subcommittee II: Specific Issues Related to 4x4 Implementation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Understanding the Basis for Forecasting of Cost Savings

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

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

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

Important Factors Not Considered in the Forecast of Cost Savings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

Respectfully submitted, Robert J. Harrington

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

A RESOLUTION ON LIBRARY ENDOWMENT FUNDS (06/6)

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

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

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

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

Adopted as amended, March 9, 2007

A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION (07/1)

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEAL

Adopted May 11, 2007