CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular Faculty Assembly held on October 4, 2011, were approved as distributed.

ASSEMBLY ACTION ON FACULTY ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION FA 12/1, “A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN TO CLARIFY THE ALLOCATION OF SEATS FOR SCHOOLS ON THE FACULTY SENATE”

Professor Michael S. Castleberry, Chair of the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee, introduced Resolution 12/1 and briefly described the proposal described therein to increase the membership of the Faculty Senate. Professor Castleberry noted that an identically worded resolution had been adopted by the Faculty Senate and forwarded to the University Administration, where it was approved for inclusion with agenda for the Assembly. Following that process, the Resolution was renumbered and placed on the Assembly agenda as an action item.

There were no questions about the Resolution, nor was there any discussion. A vote was taken, and Resolution 12/1 was adopted by the Assembly. (Resolution FA 12/1 is included with these minutes.)

REMARKS BY STEVEN KNAPP, UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

President Knapp’s remarks are included with these minutes.

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

Provost Lerman’s remarks are included with these minutes.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE

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

There being no further business before the Assembly, President Knapp adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m. after inviting everyone to the reception in the Brady Gallery on the second floor of the MPA building.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary
A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN TO CLARIFY THE ALLOCATION OF SEATS FOR SCHOOLS ON THE FACULTY SENATE (FA 12/1)

WHEREAS, Article III, Section 2, subsection (a) (3) of The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan was last amended by action of the University’s Board of Trustees on October 21, 2011, to read as follows:

“The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: the 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 Law School, three each; the Elliott School of International Affairs and the School of Public Health and Health Services, two each; and the School of Nursing, one. The faculty members shall be professors, associate professors, or assistant professors in full-time service who have tenure as of the academic year next succeeding the date of election....”;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate plays a crucial role in shared governance at the University;

WHEREAS, shared governance is strengthened by the diversity of discipline and experience manifested by the University faculty;

WHEREAS, to be effective the Faculty Senate needs to be viewed by all parties as fairly representing the entire University faculty;

WHEREAS, the current allocation of Senate seats results in a large number of small and large departments having no direct representation on the Senate;

WHEREAS, there are 19 departments with 11 or more tenure track faculty that currently do not have direct representation on the Senate, including: Accountancy, American Studies, Anatomy, Anthropology, Biochemistry, Chemistry, Computer Science, Engineering Management and Systems Engineering, History, Health Services Management and Leadership, Management, Mathematics, Media and Public Affairs, Physics, Political Science, Preventive and Community Health, Psychology, Romance, German, and Slavic Languages, Statistics, and Strategic Management and Public Policy;

WHEREAS, the current allocation of Senate seats denies the Senate the opportunity to hear directly from our colleagues in many disciplines and raises questions as to whether the Senate accurately represents the views of the entire University faculty;
WHEREAS, The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan plays a significant role in ensuring the preservation of the Faculty Senate as a strong deliberative body; and as such, it should be written in a manner that is clear, fair, and able to stand the test of time; NOW, THEREFORE,

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

(1) That Article III, Section 2, subsection (a) (3) of The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan be amended to read as follows, with such amendment to take effect commencing with the 2013-2014 session of the Faculty Senate:

“The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: the Columbian College of Arts and Science, 11 seats; the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, 3 seats; the School of Engineering and Applied Science, 4 seats; the School of Business, 5 seats; the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, 5 seats; the Law School, 4 seats; the Elliott School of International Affairs, 3 seats; the School of Public Health and Health Services, 3 seats; and the School of Nursing, 2 seats. The faculty members shall be professors, associate professors, or assistant professors in full-time service who have tenure as of the academic year next succeeding the date of election....”;

(2) That, upon adoption by the University’s Board of Trustees of the foregoing amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan, the Faculty Handbook should be revised to reflect the change set forth in that amendment.

(3) That the President, as Chairman of the Faculty Assembly, is petitioned to place on the agenda of the Faculty Assembly at its meeting on October 2, 2012, the foregoing proposed amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan.

(4) That, upon approval by the Faculty Assembly, the President is requested to forward the foregoing proposed amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan for final approval by the Board of Trustees as soon as conveniently possible.

THE WORDING OF THE AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY FA 12/1 IS IDENTICAL TO THAT PROPOSED BY SENATE RESOLUTION 11/2, WHICH WAS INTRODUCED AND ADOPTED AT THE APRIL 13, 2012 MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Adopted by the Faculty Assembly, October 2, 2012
REMARKS BY STEVEN KNAPP, UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

FACULTY ASSEMBLY, OCTOBER 2, 2012

Well, let me start out by saying in recent years, I’ve been giving a kind of a state of the union-university kind of message at this time of the year. We’re going to forego that this year because we have something very important to focus on which is the strategic plan that will guide us through the rest of this decade leading into our third century as a university, and I just want to set the stage for that a little bit. I will say it’s been an exciting year so far for a lot of reasons. This is the first time that we intentionally had our Freshman Convocation coincide with the Freshman Day of Service. Last year we were forced to do that by the hurricane, which actually fizzled a little bit, but we thought there was going to be a hurricane that was going to wash out the convocation, so we cancelled that and we ended up postponing it until it coincided with the Freshman Day of Service.

Then we discovered that actually having the combination of introducing our students to the academic life of the university as we parade in our medieval regalia, and then going from that into a service activity shared by all of our entering freshman became a very meaningful way of introducing students to two very salient aspects of this university and it’s a tradition that’s going all the way back to the founding vision of George Washington, which was to create a university that would bring students together to study in the nation’s capital and form them into a core citizen leader. So that’s been our sort of vision as an institution, and I think we now have found a powerful way of introducing new students to that. So, actually the day of the convocation, we had 2400 students fan out all across the District of Columbia to 14 schools, a number of different parks, painting and sweeping and cleaning up debris and so on, and I think it was a great introduction to the university for those students.

On that same weekend, we hosted an event that was put together by the Milken Institute which was called a Celebration of Science that brought 1200 leaders of science and government and non-profit organizations and the philanthropic community to our campus on a Friday and then again on a Sunday, and Saturday they went up to the National Institutes of Health. The purpose of it was to really make the case about the importance of the economy to the welfare of the nation and the world of continuing to invest in science, particularly with an emphasis on the life sciences. We had Nobel Laureates here including James Watson, and the head of the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation, and many other institute leaders, in fact, on this stage. The opening event was a joint interview of Magic Johnson and Dr. Tony Fauci.

Tony Fauci, of course, is the head of the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Disease, and is an expert that many of you have seen, I think, in the media, because of his expertise on HIV-AIDS, and Magic Johnson as an AIDS victim who, nevertheless, has turned that into an extraordinary engagement and leadership role, were both here on stage together and that kicked off this three-day event. So, it really was quite an extraordinary event.

About a week after that, we had the Opportunity Nation Summit take place in Lisner Auditorium. This event brings together 240 organizations that are trying to look for ways of
increasing opportunities for citizens moving up into the middle class. And so, there’s been a
great deal going on really across the university, and nothing symbolizes that level of activity
more than the many cranes that you see around here. If I were giving you a full-dress version of
the state of the university, I’d probably take you through all those; suffice it to say, we’ve got
five construction projects underway.

For those who are new to the university, one important thing to say about that is, you know, we
went through a period of building residence halls as part of a 20-year campus plan that we began
to implement several years ago. We’ve now moved from the residence halls to the academic
buildings. The largest project is the science and engineering project which is going across the
street from the Academic Center. If you’re new to the university, you’ve seen that very large
chasm there which is the excavation for the science and engineering hall. That’s a gross square
feet, about a half a million square foot building which will contain engineering and science
departments as well as having two floors that are just shelled out so that research can grow into
them as we identify new projects. It’s going to be, as I am fond of saying, by far the largest
science and engineering building six blocks from the White House that’s ever likely to be there.

And we have a new home for the School of Public Health. We’re about to break ground on the
university museum just down the street from here. There’s a parking garage next to Tonic
restaurant at Quigley’s, where we will be constructing a new academic building. We just
finished the garage, we’ll top that off, and then we’re going to be building a new -- at some
point, a new academic facility which will probably be either an extension of the Law School or
possibly of Columbian College -- we haven’t exactly decided that. There’s some shifting around
of dominoes that will guide that decision.

And then we are also building on our science and technology campus in Virginia, in Ashburn,
Virginia, a state-of-the-art conservation facility which will house some of the collection that will
be in the museum, and also give our students the opportunity to do the kind of studying that is
very relevant to our Museum Studies program, our Asian Studies, fine arts and art history. So, a
lot going on across various academic disciplines with a strong emphasis on interdisciplinary
opportunities in all these facilities that we’re putting up.

But, I think, one of the important milestones that we’re reaching this year is the development of
this new strategic plan. We haven’t done one in over a decade, and we really took a thoughtful
approach to this one, it was a little different from what sometimes happens when universities
produce strategic plans. We decided not to spend two or three years working on this, because
what happens when you do that is you get sort of an inventory of everything that’s going on in
the university. We really wanted to have a more focused exercise, and so we decided to do this
with a single academic year culminating in a retreat with the board of trustees that took place this
past June to give them an opportunity to provide feedback on some of the events -- on some of
the ideas, rather, that were being developed in the course of this planning process, and then bring
it to this assembly today, and then to the board of trustees for a final look on October 19th.

And I want to say a little bit about that plan. We really are trying to build a plan that will have
the kind of vision implicit in it that will help give us a sense of where we’re really going as an
institution, but also will provide the kind of pathway for bringing the resources that we need to
accomplish that, to make that vision a reality, and tell us a little bit about how we can make
target investments of both time and energy as well as our financial resources as we move the
university forward. We think this plan as we’re designing it will help the George Washington
University grow into an even more productive, innovative, and highly recognized university with
an even greater contribution that we can make to addressing some of those pressing challenges in
the nation and the world.

And I have to say, I give a lot of credit to Provost Lerman -- you’re going to hear from him in
just a moment. He’s going to outline some of the themes and concepts and even some examples
from the plan which is still being drafted. But I think he has led an extraordinarily thorough
process in reaching out across all constituents of the university and in integrating the advice and
the feedback that he received from all those -- and he and his team received from all those
events.

Actually, there were more than 70 meetings and other kinds of events with what we’d like to call
stakeholder groups -- that’s the current terminology for this kind of process. And input was
gathered from using public forums, luncheons, retreats, town halls, working groups. We reached
out to students, parents, faculties, staff, department chairs, deans, the board of trustees and
alumni, and I think the result is a still developing but very rich document, still in its draft form,
that identifies goals and values and connects them explicitly to the most pressing challenges
facing us as a society and suggest ways to really bring about the programs and the goals that it
recommends.

And so, I think, that implementing the plan is going to involve, I think, everyone in the
university, and we’re looking for feedback -- because we do this, we expect this to be a living
document. We don’t expect anything we’re doing in this plan to be set in stone. It really is
laying out parameters and themes that, I think, will be helpful in guiding us. But we know that
as we move into, potentially, a campaign, we’re still exploring the possibility of launching a
major comprehensive philanthropic campaign, we know that new priorities will emerge, and
some of them will be within the parameters that we’re talking about. The plan is some of them
will be things that haven’t even occurred to us, so the idea is not to use it as a straightjacket, but
really to guide our progress forward.

I would like to thank the chairs of the four working groups that the Provost Office organized to
lead this effort: Dean Doug Guthrie of the George Washington School of Business led the
working group on globalization; Sara Rosenbaum, Professor of Health Policy and of Health
Service Management and Leadership from the School of Public Health and Health Services, led
the group on governance and policy; Brian Richmond, Associate Professor of Anthropology in
the Columbian College, led the group on innovation through interdisciplinary collaboration; and
finally, Dr. Terri Reed, the Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion, led the group on citizenship
and leadership.

And it’s now my pleasure to turn the podium over to Provost Lerman to give you a little bit more
detail about how this plan has developed. Thank you.
Thank you, President Knapp. I would also like to thank all those who served on the working groups and the entire steering committee.

This plan, which is now a little over 12 months in the making, is something that has been an incredibly enlightening process for those who have had the opportunity to participate in it. It's taught us a lot about our university, it's made us think very hard about our priorities and our resources, our comparative strengths and weaknesses, and what would constitute a plan that could move GW forward.

As President Knapp noted, it has been about a decade since our last strategic plan. I would characterize the last strategic plan as focused on making investments and building great parts of the university. Ultimately, it laid the groundwork for strategic investments in some 20 plus areas in which GW already had strength in order to make those units stronger.

This new plan now takes advantage of the progress that was made. For the most part, the last plan did what it was supposed to do; those units in which we made investments did become stronger. While it's always hard to link the causality clearly and unambiguously, it's safe to say that there were many parts that we invested in over the last decade that might not have been as strong as they are today were it not for the strategic plan at that time.

This new plan aims to bring together the many parts of our university to create a unified whole that is more than the sum of those parts. The plan is centered on building greatness for the university around a shared set of themes, a common vision that leverages the great aspects the university has developed over the last 190 years of its history. This new plan has a very different feel. It's less about investing in Department A or Center B and much more about the thematic areas that cut across our schools, departments, centers, and institutes, and how we can bring faculty, students, and other people together around those themes to move the university to being a truly world-class research institution in the fields we have chosen to be great at.

We started a process we came to call strategic visioning –not our term, Eric Spiegel, who is the CEO of Siemens USA, coined it, we believe – and we basically looked at two different things. First we asked ourselves: What are the trends globally, locally, and nationally that we have to take into account in order to position the university to be effective within? The world doesn’t stay still. You don’t build a plan for today’s world; you build a plan for the world as best you can envision it for the future when the plan is mature. We went through a series of trends we thought were likely to continue and were likely to affect the position of higher education in general and GW in particular: trends such as the shifting demographics of the American and global populations. For instance, America is moving to become more Southern than Northern; it’s moving to become more diverse in its ethnic and racial background; and the number of 18- to 22-year-olds, the traditional undergraduates which we draw here, is actually going to be declining over time.
Other good examples of trends are resource constraints; growth around sustainable economic and business practices; issues of governance; issues of the cost of higher education; and shifts in technology that are enabling new modalities of teaching and learning and how the university ought to be using those.

We then turn to GW’s strengths and limitations. What are we good at and what are we not as good at? Where do we face externally imposed constraints? There are things we decided we’re good at or that are natural endowments for us: we have strong programs around public policy, not just in the Trachtenberg School of Public Policy but throughout the institution. We have programs focusing on policy in every single school in some way, shape, or form.

We have a number of outstanding schools, in part created through the investments of the last strategic plan. We have made strong capital investments, enabled by the fact that our financial management, particularly through the recession starting in 2008, has been extraordinarily good. We have been able to make commitments to faculty and to buildings at a time when many universities were facing retrenchment.

We also have a student body and a faculty that is engaged in questions of how we make a difference in the world: Our students are disproportionately inclined to volunteer; among schools our size, we have the highest participation in the Peace Corps; one of the most common jobs of our students leaving undergraduate studies is with Teach for America or the Peace Corps. We have a student body with an inclination towards thinking about how what we do in the classroom can be translated into activities for the betterment of human kind. They are engaged in politics and internships; they are engaged on Capitol Hill. Part of this is driven by another asset: our location. GW in a cornfield in Kansas is not GW in Washington, D.C. The same people, the same buildings, the same facilities, the same students if transplanted aren’t GW. Our location is part of our identity, it’s part of our strategic assets, and we need to pick those things going forward that make use of this as an asset.

Limitations. We are not an unconstrained university. Our endowment, although in absolute dollars sounds like a large number, is actually quite modest. The percentage of our operating budget that comes from endowment income is quite small compared with many of our peers, and our student body is large, so we are a relatively large university with, for our peer group, a small endowment.

We have externally imposed restrictions as well. We have a limit on the number of students that is part of our campus master plan. We agreed with the District of Columbia to cap the number of students here in Foggy Bottom and the number of students at Mount Vernon Campus, and we live within these caps. We cannot grow our student body in unrestricted ways, particularly on those two campuses. We have some issues with physical infrastructure as well. We use our space extremely intensively. In addition, many of our business systems were designed for a smaller university that was less research intensive. We are working hard to catch up in both areas. President Knapp talked about some of the major capital investments we’re making.
What comes out of these constraints thematically? How can we think about themes around which we can unite our activities? This conversation went on for multiple months among those of us developing the strategic plan. Many of the discussions and forums were held precisely around these questions. Ultimately, we came up with four thematic areas that, we believe, if invested in, can link together and enhance many of our strengths.

First: The world is becoming ever more globalized. GW, to be a great university, cannot be simply a national institution; it must be both national and international. This theme translates in many concrete ways. Right now we not only draw disproportionately from the United States for our undergraduate population, but we draw heavily from a few sub-regions. We must become a fully national institution, attracting students from the entire nation. And we must become more definitively a global institution. How does this translate? One action we are putting in the plan is that we ought to increase the number of international students at GW. Right now, about six percent of our undergraduates are international; we ought to be doubling that. That’s an example of translating a theme into a concrete action. The plan, which you’ll receive in draft form for further comment, calls for increases in the number of international students.

A second theme builds on a strength I already talked about: emphasizing education and research in the areas of governance and policy, although not to the exclusion of everything else a great university does. Every one of our 10 schools has strength in these areas. We need to bring these strengths together in ways that make them more visible, that make GW the university for all those students who have profound interests in governance and policy questions, whether governance in terms of legislative bodies and executive bodies or in other senses, such as corporate governance, for example, in our business school.

The third theme is what we’re now calling innovation through cross-disciplinary collaboration. The underlying hypothesis here is that the problems that most interest us and that are most important for our society frequently are problems that are never going to be solved through a single disciplinary perspective. Let me give you a concrete example that we talked a lot about in our planning process: health care. Problems of health care are economic problems, they’re technological problems, they’re social psychology problems, they’re problems of organization and health-care delivery and corporations. No one discipline is likely to have the silver bullet for solving the health-care problem; otherwise, we would have solved it already. The solutions to our nation’s health-care challenges and to global health-care challenges for that matter, rest in bringing together people from many disciplines, where we as a university have strength, and creating an environment in which they can easily and readily collaborate across disciplines to work on shared areas of interest. That’s the great challenge.

Universities, historically, aren’t very good at this. We built our university’s strength from the disciplines upward, so we’re organized into departments, in schools that are discipline-centric. Our core strength is built from this structure. What we have to do is make it easier for people to work across disciplinary boundaries. We have to change incentive systems where the incentive systems are getting in the way. We have to encourage teaching across disciplines. We already have some great examples underway.
Let me talk about one of these: the sustainability minor. This is the first year that the minor is in effect. The foundational course, led by Professor Lisa Benton-Short, is taught by five faculties from five different schools. We need to do this more often. The budget model we have and the incentives we have in place often don’t reward this sort of activity. How do we create more cross-disciplinary opportunities while still preserving the strengths in the disciplines?

The fourth area is citizenship and leadership. We mean this in a very broad sense that hearkens back to President George Washington’s original vision for this university: a place that educates the next generation of citizens and leaders. How do we inculcate in our students an understanding of their responsibilities and their rights as citizens at multiple levels? How do we teach them the skills to lead effectively in diverse settings? As the country and the world become more diverse, how do you lead in organizations in which many of the people are not quite like you in many different ways? How do you create environments where everyone can function to full potential? Our university, GW, also needs to exercise our institutional responsibilities effectively and to the betterment of the region in which our university is located. These are the kind of questions and actions we’ve been contemplating.

This has led us to a set of objectives and actions. While I can’t go through all of them let me give you a sampling of some of the concrete actions in this plan.

The last strategic plan did not emphasize the need to grow the faculty; there were other priorities. In this new plan, we are calling for hiring between 50 and 100 additional faculty, specifically faculty who have both a strong disciplinary base and a passion for and abiding interest in working across disciplines. We’re going to be creating, over the life of this plan, 50 to 100 new, permanent tenured faculty lines across the 10 schools. These will be faculty with an abiding interest in participating in one of the cross-disciplinary research areas we’re going to be funding.

Next, we need to increase the amount and quality of funding for graduate and post-doctoral students, particularly as the competition for the best students grows. If we aspire to “play in the big league,” we need to invest resources to attract talented graduate students. Our stipends have been set too low for a period of time and have not risen. We need to improve the quality of our doctoral and graduate support and also the number of “packages” we offer our graduate students. As we continue to grow our research base, we will be continuing to attract more students who need support for their research.

We plan to create new cross-disciplinary research centers and, in some cases, centers that also have educational programs. In the last year, we have launched the sustainability initiative as well as the Global Women’s Institute and the Computational Biology Institute. These institutes are largely under the leadership of Vice President Leo Chalupa and bring together faculty from different disciplinary backgrounds to work on shared problems. We think we need to create a limited number of these cross-disciplinary institutes so each one will have the resources to be successful. We need anywhere from four to eight additional funded institutes over the life of this plan, and we have to choose these research areas wisely.
There have been many conversations about creating a more unified undergraduate experience at GW. We need to work toward consensus around what the core competency of every GW graduate ought to be. Right now, there is not enough shared understanding. Each school has its own major requirements and school requirements. Many of these are great requirements, but we lack a university-wide vision for our university. We’re calling for a process involving the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate as a whole, in creating a working group to do two big things.

First: begin thinking deeply about the core knowledge and skills every undergraduate student should acquire at GW.

Second: should we give our students greater flexibility by admitting them to the university as a whole rather than to a particular school? Today it's often complicated for students to double major across schools. For example, if a student wants to double major in philosophy and accounting, this often turns out to be very difficult in our environment. Yet there's no intellectually good reason for this difficulty other than the fact that we admit our students to schools and that we budget by schools. Logically, there are a set of majors you can combine with other majors and a set of minors you can combine with certain majors.

We need to begin from ground zero and say, “Why do we do that?” When we have a university with a more integrated identity, if in fact we simply admit our students to the university, then at some point, they will choose majors and take most of their courses in those majors. That will link to the question of, what should every student know? What type of course or courses should they be taking? I don't know, and I don't think it's actually the provost's role to know, what this core should be. What I do know is we need to engage in a conversation around these ideas and think them through.

Now, let me talk about resources. The resources needed to undertake this plan fall into a range. There is a set of resources over the life of this plan that we know we can obtain with reasonable certainty; these are new funds we know we’re going to get from fairly reliable sources, particularly the Innovation Task Force work to date. We think that, over the life of this plan, this will yield at last $100 million of expendable money. We also believe that many of the ideas in this plan will resonate with potential donors, so there’s a component of the budget for this plan, beyond the original base of a little over $100 million, that we believe will be derived from philanthropy. The Development Office has been actively engaged in looking at this plan and is willing to put some stakes in the ground around their targets for fund raising. We think we can raise at least twice the $100 million for the goals aligned with this plan.

Each of the actions in the plan has a range. That range reflects variables in support from philanthropic sources.

Now the timeline for finalizing the plan. As President Knapp said, this plan is nearing completion. The draft plan will be posted on the provost website (provost.gwu.edu). We welcome your comments and feedback, which you can provide via the website or simply by writing to me or anyone on the steering committee. We'll be continuing to hold discussions and forums; the 70 meetings we've held to date are just part of a series. We'll have at least one major town hall. In addition, I'm hosting at my house
forums I'm calling Dinner and Dialogue – some of you may have been to one of these – at which we talk about the strategic plan over what I would hope is a good dinner. We've also organized a series of lunches. Virtually every department chair has been invited to attend a lunch with six or seven of his or her peers for conversation with Forrest Maltzman and me about the plan. We'll be continuing these.

We're going to continue to engage in discussions about this plan with all stakeholders. The trustees will see the plan in about two weeks. The draft will be fine-tuned over the semester as we get input from you and others. It will eventually go back to the Board of Trustees for final comments.

Finally, let me say, the planning process has been an amazing experience. We have developed a set of intellectually exciting ideas that have the potential to really propel this university forward. Obviously, the goal of the plan isn’t the plan; the goal of the plan is to do something from the plan. The ultimate test of whether this has been an effective use of our time will be in what we do and what the outcomes of the plan’s actions are. We’re about to engage in a pretty exciting period in which we will be making major investments over the next decade around the themes of the plan.
First, I want to extend a warm welcome to the members of the Faculty Assembly, the emeriti faculty, and newly-appointed faculty here today. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I offer the following brief report.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

There were two resolutions approved by the Senate during the 2011-12 session. These were forwarded to the Administration for its response.

Resolution 11/1, A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Organization Plan to Provide Representation for the School of Nursing on the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

This Resolution was adopted as amended at the September 9, 2011 Faculty Senate meeting. It was forwarded to the Administration and was approved. At its annual meeting on October 4, 2011, the Faculty Assembly approved these amendments to the Organization Plan by adopting Faculty Assembly Resolution FA 11/1. The Board of Trustees approved these amendments to the Organization Plan at its meeting in October, 2011.

Resolution 11/2, A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Organization Plan to clarify the Allocation of Seats for Schools on the Faculty Senate

Substitute Resolution 11/2, which amends the Organization Plan to provide eleven more seats for schools represented in the Faculty Senate, effective with the 2013-14 session, was adopted at the Senate meeting held on April 13, 2012. It was forwarded to the Administration, was approved, and the corresponding Assembly Resolution, 12/1 is before the Assembly today for its consideration.

In addition, Resolution 12/1, A Resolution to Endorse Amendments to The George Washington University Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Investigators, was considered and adopted at the first meeting of the 2012-13 Senate session on May 11, 2012. Because of the August deadline for changes to the Policy, following adoption by the Senate, the Resolution was forwarded to the Administration along with Resolutions for the 2011-12 session. The Administration approved the Resolution and changes to the Policy were approved at the May 2012 meeting of the Board of Trustees.

REPORTS

The Faculty Senate heard presentations during the 2011-12 session, including an Update on the Science and Engineering Hall (SEH) from the Physical Facilities Committee. Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz and his staff presented Updates on the Parking Transition (made necessary by demolition of the University Parking Garage), and the Status of the Human Resources Office. In October the Provost reported
on the Reorganization of the Provost’s Office. He also provided an update on the College of Professional Studies and the Honors Program. In November, the Provost provided the first Update on the Development of the University’s Strategic Plan. At the December meeting, Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz presented an Update on Debt Restructuring and the Financing of New Construction for the Science and Engineering Hall, School of Public Health and Health Services building, and the Textile/GW Museum.

At the February Senate meeting, Provost Lerman briefed the Senate on proposed changes to the University’s Sexual Harassment Policy and corresponding procedures. Discussion of these policies continues into the 2012-13 session. Sabrina Ellis, the University’s new Vice President for Human Resources, was introduced to the Senate and made comments about benefits planning. In March, Provost Lerman presented the Annual Report on Core Indicators of Academic Excellence and a report on development activities with specific emphasis on the SEH was made by Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations Development Morsberger.

At the April meeting, Athletics Director Nero reported on the Athletics and Recreation Strategic Plan. Associate Provost Scarboro reported on the International Strategic Plan, and Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee Chair Cordes presented an Update on the University Budget. In addition, Provost Lerman provided another update on the development of the University’s Strategic Plan and the expected timeline going forward.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Grievances

One grievance was heard during the 2011-2012 academic year and continues into the current term.

Nonconcurrences

Three administrative nonconcurrences with faculty recommendations in tenure and promotion cases were transmitted to the Executive Committee in May and June 2012: two in the School of Business, and one in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences. The Executive Committee reviewed these cases and made its recommendations in each case to the University Administration over the summer.

A fourth administrative nonconcurrence from Columbian College was transmitted to the Executive Committee in early September. The Executive Committee will review this case and at the conclusion of this process, provide its recommendation to the Administration.

Respectfully submitted,

*Michael S. Castleberry, Chair*
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