The George Washington University
Washington, D.C.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Of the Faculty Senate Held on
March 9, 2007, in the Alumni House

The meeting was called to order by Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, at 2:20 p.m.

Present: Registrar Amundson, Parliamentarian Johnson; Dean Phillips; Professors Artz, Biles, Cordes, Garris, Griffith, Gupta, Helgert, Marotta, Pagel, Robinson, Simon, Wade, Wilmarth, Wirtz, Yezer, and Zea

Absent: President Trachtenberg, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman; Deans Brown, Futrell, Katz, Lawrence, Scott, Tong, and Whitaker; Professors Briscoe, Castleberry, Delaney, Englander, Gallo, Galston, Harrington, Mueller, Pelzman, Rycroft, and Wahlbeck

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on February 16, 2007 were amended on page two to reflect a bed count of 88, rather than the 78 reported in Pelham Hall at the Mount Vernon campus. The minutes were approved as amended.

Resolution 06/6, “A Resolution on Library Endowment Funds”

Professor Alan G. Wade, Chair of the Libraries Committee, introduced Resolution 06/6. He explained that a similar Resolution (05/7) had been adopted at the April 14, 2006 Senate meeting, but the Administration in its response indicated that the Resolution needed further study. To this end, the Libraries Committee met several times during the fall semester to discuss Resolution 05/7. Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman was also consulted during this process. Resolution 06/6 is the result of those discussions, and its provisions are very similar to those in Resolution 05/7.

Professor Griffith asked if Resolution 06/6, as a restatement of Resolution 05/7, should be considered as a substitute resolution. Discussion followed, and it was determined that the Resolution should not be introduced as a substitute, but as a new resolution.

Professor Wade then outlined the differences between provisions of Resolution 05/7 and Resolution 06/6. In Resolution 06/6, the fifth Whereas Clause of Resolution 05/7 was revised to make it clear that funding for collections in the Gelman Library System is significantly lower than funding for library collections at most institutions in the University’s market basket. In addition, the three Resolving Clauses of Resolution 05/7 read as follows:
1. That the University request that the University Librarian provide a five-year plan through which, by gradual increases in the library collection budget beginning in FY 2008, the collection budget will reach a level equal to the mean level of ARL libraries in GW’s market basket group; and

2. That the University Administration prepare an annual report for the Faculty Senate on its progress in meeting the goals set out in the five-year plan provided by the University Librarian; and

3. That the University Administration further make the Gelman Library System a high priority in fund raising in order to increase the endowment for it so as to help meet the goals set out in Resolving Clause 1.

In Resolution 06/6, the first Resolving Clause reads as follows (new language substituted for that in Resolution 05/7 appears in italics):

1. That the University Administration request that the University Librarian provide 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

Professor Wade explained that one of the reasons why the Administration did not accept Resolution 05/7 was because it required that funding levels be met within a specific period of time. Vice President Lehman had indicated that the Administration did not feel it could meet the target within a five-year time frame. Resolution 06/6 also makes it clear that funding increases for the Gelman Library collections should not be made at the expense of other needs of the Library, such as staffing and space needs. In addition, the second Resolving Clause in Resolution 05/7 was excised in its entirety.

The second Resolving Clause of Resolution 06/6 reads as follows:

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).

Professor Wade explained that elevating Gelman Library to University-level status would give it the same status as a college or school, which will permit the library to expand its fundraising efforts beyond present boundaries.

Professor Gupta inquired about the administration’s response to resolution 05/7, and he asked if there was any indication that Resolution 06/6 would be acceptable. Professor Wilmarth said that Vice President Lehman had indicated to the Executive Committee that Resolution 06/6 was satisfactory. Professor Robinson agreed with this observation.
Professor Wirtz questioned whether or not it was wise for the Senate to adopt resolutions calling for the funding of individual projects without considering where the money would come from. He said he thought it was a mistake not to acknowledge that choosing one project over another involves trade-offs, and the Senate should consider this. Professor Wirtz then asked where additional funds for library collections would come from and what would be sacrificed as the result of directing funding toward this goal.

Professor Pagel, who serves as the Law Librarian, congratulated Professor Wade and the Libraries Committee for redrafting the Resolution. He added that he hoped the University would accept Resolution 06/6 because he thought it was about as mild as possible, given the crisis at Gelman. Out of a group of fifteen market basket schools identified by the University, only one, Tulane, spends less on its collections then does GW. Professor Pagel said that, frankly, he thought this information should be furnished to any faculty member considering accepting a position at GW, because the University Library is not able to meet the needs of a research-oriented institution, and given present funding constraints, the Library is unlikely to ever reach the status required by a research institution. Professor Pagel agreed with Professor Wirtz that there are many needs to be met at the University, but the Resolution simply asks that Gelman be given additional assistance in creating an endowment for the collections, and not that the University provide funds from tuition or another existing resource. Professor Pagel reiterated that Resolution 06/6 was an appropriate and restrained request for assistance to Gelman Library and said he thought Gelman might as well shut its doors if faculty thought this request was too much.

Discussion followed. Professor Simon agreed in part with Professor Wirtz’s observation that it is inappropriate for the Senate to fail to indicate priorities when requesting funding for specific purposes. Professor Simon also said that several years ago, the Gelman Library System’s cost per volume/serial was inordinately high, and though he was told that this was because the system’s costs included the medical and law libraries, he questioned the assertion that GW spends less on collections that any other market basket institution other than Tulane.

Librarian Siggins recalled the discussion a year ago in the Senate when President Trachtenberg distributed an index prepared by the Association of Research Libraries from The Chronicle of Higher Education. This index purported to compare GW Library expenditures with those of other institutions of comparable rank, rather than with GW’s market basket schools. Librarian Siggins said that an index such as this does not take into consideration the types of services the GLS provides. It also does not take into account other important factors, such the issue of contracts with outside vendors who supply these services.

A central problem for the Library is that GW’s administrative structure requires it to be in competition for fundraising and budget with each of the schools individually. It is not allowed to approach alumni of the schools but must instead develop its own constituency, which is very difficult. At other institutions, for example, Johns Hopkins, money for library purposes is controlled by the deans, and they support it from their budgets. At GW, the Library receives no direct funding from the schools or colleges. This Advancement Office policy, which has come down from the highest levels of GW’s administration, has created an environment and attitude about the role of the Library as an “add on,” or something that is
Discussion followed. Professor Griffith said the language of the Resolution was unclear, but that if funds from the operating budget and fundraising initiatives were being requested, then it seemed to him the points raised by Professor Simon and Professor Wirtz were very apposite. The Resolution as it stands does not offer much that is helpful as it does not indicate even a percentage of revenue which would be appropriate. He added that the Resolution might receive a better fate if it had been presented to the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee for its review before it had come to the Senate. Professor Wade assured Professor Griffith that the Libraries Committee had been provided with a great deal of this sort of information, but as the Resolution requests that the Librarian present a plan by which the University could go forward, presentation of this information with the Resolution was deemed premature.

Professor Wilmarth moved that the first Resolving Clause be amended to provide that the Faculty Senate would review the plan submitted by the University Librarian by adding the words “the Faculty Senate, for its consideration and response, a plan by which” after the word “provide.” Professor Robinson questioned this amendment, asking if this was an appropriate role for the Senate which normally makes observations and identifies needs, rather than evaluating administrative decisions in minute detail.

Professor Gupta said he did not understand why the Librarian could not be asked to submit a plan to the Libraries Committee for its evaluation, which would then come to the Senate, rather than asking the Senate to ask the Administration to ask the Librarian to develop a plan. Professor Wirtz spoke in opposition to the amendment, as he thought the amendment did not address his concern. He said that he had no reason to doubt the veracity of the information given by Professor Pagel or by Librarian Siggins, but once numbers are presented by the Committee or the Senate, the Administration will provide a different set of data, and nothing will be settled. He reiterated that it is not clear what impact the Resolution, if adopted, will have on the overall University budget and on other possibly competing sources of funding. He then recommended that an independent study group from outside the University be called in to evaluate the status of the Library.

Professor Griffith seconded the motion and agreed with Professor Wirtz’s assertion that more information is needed. He also agreed with Professor Gupta, that the Senate, rather than the Administration, should be asked to request a plan from the Librarian. Professor Wade observed that the route set forth for the Librarian’s plan in Resolution 06/6 is identical to that adopted last year in Resolution 05/7. Professor Simon said that no one yet knows what the new President’s priorities are going to be, and he agreed with the need to examine the total University budget environment before issuing yet another request for funding.

Professor Cordes apologized for coming late to the meeting, and said that he also had a problem with the Senate issuing Resolutions concerning funding without indicating the priority of requests. Further discussion followed. Vice President for Advancement Laurel Price Jones agreed that piecemeal recommendations can be problematic; these must
be sorted out by senior administrators when they decide upon funding priorities. The Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence lays out quite a number of goals, but it does not indicate priorities either, nor does it attach numbers to the goals. She said what she expected to come out of the transition to a new Administration, and certainly out of any conversation about a new capital campaign, is a very strict set of fundraising priorities which would probably turn out to be larger than the campaign goal itself. Professor Biles said he thought he had just heard a suggestion that the broad fundraising plan based on priorities would be developed exclusively by the Administration, and he thought it would be relevant for the faculty to begin developing a process to reflect the faculty’s view on what the priorities for a billion dollar campaign should be rather than waiting for it to be presented as a fait accompli. Discussion followed between Professor Griffith and Vice President Price Jones concerning fundraising processes in general, during which Vice President Price Jones indicated that fundraising priority-setting must always include deans and faculty.

Professor Pagel said that the problem over the past ten years has been reliance upon the GW Administration to set funding priorities and it has set the Gelman Library as the lowest priority. Many projects at GW have been built at the expense of Gelman, which has not received the money it needs. A quick look at information from the American Association of Research Libraries shows that for 2003-04 Gelman spent $5 million to support its collections. By contrast Northwestern expended $8.3 million, Miami, $6.7 million, Boston, $6.8 million, and Duke, $9.1 million. Professor Pagel pointed out that if GW is to be competitive in attracting faculty, prospective recruits need to know that the University is spending more than a million dollars less per year than the average of its market basket schools, and the level of research support at GW will be correspondingly less than elsewhere. Professor Robinson observed that Gelman’s basic collection was smaller from the outset than that at other institutions with which it is compared. That, coupled with the amount of money GW has spent to add to Library collections over the years makes it impossible for Gelman to catch up to, much less compete with, its market basket schools.

Professor Yezer said he thought Gelman Library was doing an excellent job with existing funding, particularly with respect to electronic holdings. He spoke in support of the Resolution and the development of a plan to secure additional resources for collections so that they can not only be maintained, but enhanced.

Professor Wirtz advised the Senate if it did not agree with his suggestion that an independent entity evaluate the Library and its needs, he would like to have the plan formulated by the University Librarian vetted by both the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting and Libraries Committees, with a view toward clearly stating the impact of any Library funding request upon other University priorities. Professor Wade expressed bewilderment at the Senate’s reaction to Resolution 06/6, observing again that the Administration had indicated that it would be acceptable once the five-year time frame specified in Resolution 05/7 was eliminated.

Professor Wilmarth moved that the first Resolving Clause be further amended to include the following language (after the phrase University Librarian), “in consultation with the Committee on Libraries and Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting.” The motion was seconded. Discussion followed between Professors Wade, Robinson, and
Simon. The question was called on the amendment, a vote was taken, and the amendment passed.

There being no further discussion on the Resolution, the question was called, a vote was taken, and Resolution 06/6 as twice amended, was adopted. (Resolution 06/6 is attached.)

**REPORT ON SERVICE-LEARNING**

Professor Robinson introduced Professor Lisa Benton-Short, Acting Chair of the Senate Committee on University and Urban Affairs, thanked her for her outstanding leadership, and commended the work of Committee members.

Professor Benton-Short distributed a Report on Service-Learning prepared in January, 2007 by the Service-Learning Advisory Board (SLAB), which she Co-Chairs. The Report was submitted to members of the Senate Committee on University and Urban Affairs, which concerns itself with town/gown issues and making good connections with the community. The Report received the Committee’s endorsement, and Professor Benton-Short was asked to present it to the Senate, to provide information to and generate awareness among Senate members about faculty interest in service-learning projects. (The Report is attached.)

For those unfamiliar with the concept of service-learning, Professor Benton-Short reviewed its definition; service-learning is a philosophy and teaching methodology that integrates meaningful community service into [the] course curriculum to enhance academic rigor by helping students achieve learning outcomes. Service-learning differs from volunteering or internships in that it is faculty-initiated and deliberately links educational outcomes to a particular course. As noted in the Report, “Faculty grade or assess the quality and rigor of service-learning through student reflection (i.e., writing essays, group discussion, projects, and assembling a portfolio) as well as evaluation by community partners.” Service-learning initiatives address a need that a community partner (such as a local or federal agency, or a non-profit or profit entity) identifies as an important priority. The intersection of campus and community interests creates an opportunity for reciprocal learning which is an important goal of service-learning.

Professor Benton-Short pointed out that service-learning allows students to apply and adapt knowledge that is taught in the classroom with specific real-world issues and projects. For a number of faculty, it is an important means for connecting course material to unmet community needs and governmental policy. This connection can be direct, where, for example, students might assist individuals in the community, serve in agency quarters, tutor a child, assist in income tax preparation for low-income clients, or work in a soup kitchen. It can also be indirect, where students work on grant-writing, community-based research, or program evaluations. Professor Benton-Short gave an example from her own Urban Geography class, where students worked with a community partner, So Others Might Eat (SOME), to identify a wide range of social services, which the students then mapped using computer spatial analysis tools. The class of twenty students mapped nearly all the social services in the District and provided nearly fifty different maps for the organization to
use. The map project has not only proven useful to SOME, but has also been distributed to a coalition of homeless organizations in the City.

More than thirty faculty in seventeen departments at GW have integrated service-learning into one or more of their courses in disciplines as diverse as Bio-Statistics, Communication, Management, Geography, Public Policy, Sociology, and Human Services. A complete list of participating departments is set forth in the Report. Authors of the Service-Learning Report believe that much more can be done, and to that end, the Report contains a number of key recommendations, the first of which addresses staffing needs, and requests funding for two full-time service-learning positions dedicated to supporting, coordinating, and expanding this activity throughout the University. The Board also recommends providing resources for faculty to include the following:

1. Service-learning should be introduced at new faculty orientation
2. Second, financial resources should be set aside for the ongoing training and development of faculty and service-learning
3. For faculty who develop service-learning projects, GW should provide either development funds or course relief
4. Service-learning should be included and valued in tenure and promotion
5. That funds should be made available for faculty to attend service-learning conferences
6. That service-learning should also be included and valued as a part of service to the University and
7. More practically the faculty requested that there be a web-based faculty resource guide. Those already exist at American, Georgetown, and the University of Maryland; and
8. That faculty meet in an ongoing forum to discuss challenges and solutions to integrating students, community and curricular requirements.

The Report also outlines recommendations for providing resources to students participating in service-learning, as set forth on page 9.

Professor Wirtz said that it was obvious that a lot of work had been put into the development of service-learning initiatives and the Report, both of which he thought commendable. He inquired about the extent of collaboration by the D.C. government in such initiatives. Professor Benton-Short noted that one of the SLAB members is Richard Sawaya, Vice President for Government, International, and Corporate Affairs. As faculty from many units at GW were invited by the Board to share information about the kinds of projects they had conducted, Vice President Sawaya’s office became very interested in identifying faculty who have worked with governmental offices so that the University can acknowledge the work that has been done and develop partnerships for future projects. It is also likely that faculty who have participated in service-learning projects specifically connected with the D.C. government will be invited to make a presentation at a D.C. Council meeting in the near future. Advisory Board Co-Chair Emily Morrison was introduced and gave several examples of collaborative projects with D.C. government agencies, including Youth Service America.
Professor Griffith said it wasn’t clear to him which office the service-learning initiative reported to administratively. Professor Benton-Short responded that the Advisory Board is an independent initiative formed when several faculty, staff, and students engaged in service-learning came together last year to see how they could enhance and develop these programs. The Report was generated in part to inform faculty who are interested in doing this type of work, and was also designed to raise awareness of these programs for faculty who are unaware that such programs exist. Ms. Morrison reviewed the membership of the Board, which includes a faculty member with tenure, as well as students, administrative staff, and community partners. Ms. Morrison noted that, before moving to the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, she was formerly in the Office of Community Service (OCS) which serves as a clearinghouse for service learning projects under Student and Academic Support Services. She added that she has continued her interest in and work on service-learning initiatives as Co-Chair of the Advisory Board.

Professor Griffith and Professor Cordes both asked if there was someone in the undergraduate dean’s offices assigned to help develop and monitor service-learning initiatives. Professor Benton-Short said that is not the case at GW, although other institutions, such as Stanford University, provide such assistance. Ms. Morrison noted that service-learning has evolved over the years and is now more faculty-based than before. It promotes a different type of student engagement in learning than that which takes place in the classroom. At other institutions where service-learning is better established, advisory boards review courses and projects, and these groups serve to certify that initiatives meet pre-established standards.

Professor Garris asked how liability issues are treated in service-learning programs where students can be unwittingly directed by a professor to dangerous off-campus locations. As an engineering faculty member who teaches laboratory courses, there is always a concern that a student could be injured in the laboratory and sue the professor. However, when faculty inquire about whether or not the University indemnifies the professor, the response is always that the University is self-insured and thus the University may, or may not, choose to provide indemnity for individual faculty members. Professor Benton-Short responded that some control over student exposure can be exercised by faculty members; for example, in her course, students choose their own projects rather than their being assigned. In addition, they work with another student or in a group, and no mandatory evening events are scheduled. Ms. Morrison related that while she was in the OCS she contacted all of the community partners and established memoranda of understanding governing service-learning projects, and legal services at GW has developed a waiver form for students participating in service-learning programs. In some cases, insurance by community partners can play a role in limiting legal liability, but there is, of course, no way to totally eliminate risk either on or off campus. Of equal importance is maintaining a dialogue with participants on how to make safe decisions about working in an urban area such as Washington, D.C.

Professor Yezer pointed out that most of GW’s schools have a curriculum committee in place, and he said he thought this would be the proper venue for reviewing the content of courses with a service-learning component since these are similar to internships. Professor Benton-Short responded that she supervises several internships, and reiterated that interning is a very different experience from that produced by the service-learning model.
Professor Cordes agreed with Professor Yezer's point about the role of curriculum committees, and he said that he thought that if service-learning was to become a more formalized part of the curriculum, it should be presented to the appropriate group at the school level. This review ought to take place, he added, before a proposal is presented to the University president, present or future.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINEES FOR ELECTION TO THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE 2007-08 SESSION

Professor Robinson moved the nominations of the following faculty members to the Nominating Committee: Charles A. Garris, Jr., (SEAS), Convener, Kurt J. Darr (SPHHS), Linda L. Gallo (SMHS), Mary J. Granger (SB), Barbara D. Miller (ESIA), Scott B. Pagel (GWLS), Alan G. Wade (CCAS), and Lynda L. West (GSEHD). The entire slate was approved.

II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Robinson presented the Report of the Executive Committee, which is enclosed.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Griffith noted that the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, which he chairs, has been circulating a draft report to Committee members on financial aspects of sponsored research. He said he anticipated this report would be finalized and ready to present at the April Senate meeting, and he requested that the report be placed on the agenda before the expected presentation by Chief Research Officer Elliot Hirshman. Professor Robinson agreed that the item would be placed on the Senate Executive Committee agenda.

Professor Wirtz observed that neither President Trachtenberg nor Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman was present at the meeting to entertain his query, but he asked for an administrative explanation of the (apparently final) University decision to change the allocation of merit- and need-based student financial assistance. This decision was apparently reached without the involvement of faculty at any point along the way. A recent article in the publication Inside Higher Education gives the impression that relatively well-to-do families with bright students need not apply to GW. Professor Griffith said that Senior Vice President for Student and Academic Support Services Chernak had presented an extensive report to the Budget Working Group about the University’s intention to shift funds from merit- to need-based aid. Professor Wirtz said he thought it would have been more appropriate for the matter to have been brought to the attention of the Educational Policy Committee. Professor Griffith noted that no decision had been reached by the Budget Working Group; it had merely received the report which he thought could probably be presented to the Senate by Vice President Chernak.
A short discussion followed between Professors Griffith, Cordes, and Yezer on various aspects of student financial assistance. Professor Griffith pointed out that very recently, the National Commission on Education had recommended [and Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings had urged] that institutions move in the direction of allocating more funding to need- rather than merit-based financial aid.

Professor Biles reiterated his previous point about faculty involvement in administrative decision-making and priority setting. If there is soon to be a major fundraising activity, faculty certainly want to be involved, and perhaps the lesson from the 4x4 process is that the faculty ought to define how it wants to be involved rather than just waiting for the administration to hand-pick a small number of faculty. This is an issue to be developed, perhaps by the fall semester.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made, seconded, and approved, the meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary
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
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At The George Washington University Service-Learning is becoming a priority for students and faculty alike. The intent of this report is to raise awareness and identify ways in which the university can expand support and enhance faculty, student, and staff involvement with Service-Learning. In this report, the Service-Learning Advisory Board outlines:

- Defining Service-Learning (p. 4)
- Current Service-Learning Activities at GW (p. 4)
- Key Partners Involved (p. 6)
- Future Recommendations for Advancing Service-Learning at GW (p. 8)
- Appendix I: Service-Learning 5 Year Plan (p. 11)
- Appendix II: Selected Examples of Service-Learning at GW and student projects (p. 16)
- Appendix III: Student Reflections on Service-Learning (p. 27)

Introduction:

Millions of federal, state, and local community dollars are spent each year in the U.S. on higher education, which is tasked with developing both citizens and leaders of its students. In the last decade, scholars bemoaned the lack of civic engagement in the United States in terms of both citizenship and leadership (Astin, 1996; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Gardner, 1990; Greenleaf, 1996; Woyach, 1992) and called on institutions of higher education to deliver on their promise. A primary way to actualize this promise is through student community involvement, which allows colleges not only to develop students into stronger citizens and leaders capable of addressing the rapidly changing and demanding concerns of the world, but also to meet the obligation that institutions have to contribute back to the communities that support them (Barber, 1994; Saltmarsh, 1996; Stanton, 1990; Zlotkowski, 1996).

Service-Learning is both a philosophy and a teaching methodology that is gaining acceptance within higher education (Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999). Rooted in the educational theories of John Dewey and Paulo Freire, Service-Learning has been described as a philosophy of education whose primary tenet is that social responsibility and the experience of education are inextricably linked. This pedagogy does not assume that learning and development will necessarily occur merely as a result of studying a theory or providing service. Rather it is the reflection activities required in Service-Learning that allow students to make connections between what they are learning in the classroom and what they experience through service (Jacoby, 1996; Kendall, 1990). The experiences should address actual community identified needs, be integrated into the students’ curriculum, allow for reflection time, and enhance what the student is learning in the classroom. Service-Learning differs from volunteerism, community service, internships and field experience because it equally benefits the provider and the
recipient of the service while being rigorously integrated into a course curriculum. In addition, Service-Learning has an equal focus on both the service that is being provided and the learning that is taking place.

Research shows that service combined with critical reflection is one means towards fostering citizenship and leadership by developing skills, knowledge, and abilities that reflect a broader or more inclusive worldview among college students (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999; Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997). Research has also demonstrated that curriculum that integrates Service-Learning is effective at retaining students, deepening content understanding and increasing rates of alumni giving (Astin & Sax, 1998 and 1999).

Service-Learning courses create a dynamic relationship between academics and community engagement, often called *reciprocal learning*. As a result of the service component, this pedagogy makes possible a myriad of academic benefits for the students and faculty. Research and professor feedback have consistently demonstrated that the *reciprocal learning* provided by Service-Learning courses are directly responsible for the following academic benefits of participating students:

- Enhanced cognitive mastery of academic concepts: “active learning” (service) creates a stronger integration between students and course content unique from traditional courses (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Hollis, 2002).
- Higher quality student work: with the subsequent impact of deeper course integration, student essays, tests, and presentations demonstrate deeper understanding of academic material (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Hironimus-Wendt & Lovell-Troy, 1999).
- Improved ability to analyze real-world problems: accomplished through the experience of firsthand exposure to complex issues of the real-world and the course’s effort to address them (Hollis, 2002; Parker-Gwin & Marby, 1998).
- Increased critical thinking ability: with genuine experiences of service to draw from, students develop wider perspectives with which to critically contemplate theory, reading assignments, and discussions (Hollis, 2002; Hironimus-Wendt & Lovell-Troy, 1999).

The George Washington University, an independent academic institution chartered by the Congress of the United States in 1821, dedicates itself to furthering human well-being. The George Washington University draws upon the rich array of resources from the National Capital Area to enhance its educational endeavors. In return, the University, through its students, faculty, staff, and alumni, contributes talent and knowledge to improve the quality of life in metropolitan Washington, D.C. Thus GW has the explicit responsibility and obligation to prepare students with the knowledge and practice of being socially responsible citizens in a diverse democracy and increasingly interconnected world.
I Defining Service-Learning

Service-Learning is a philosophy and teaching methodology that integrates meaningful community service into course curriculum to enhance academic rigor by helping students achieve learning outcomes.

Service-Learning addresses the community-identified needs while accessing community resources. Such resources include the expertise of the faculty, the wisdom and learning of local leaders, as well as the cultural diversity often found in local communities. Moreover, Service-Learning addresses a need that a community partner identifies as an important priority, creating the opportunity for “reciprocal learning” between the campus and the community. Service-Learning is also an important pedagogical tool, requiring students to apply and adapt the knowledge taught in the classroom to address real world issues.

Service-Learning is a viable means for connecting course material to unmet community needs and governmental policy. Service-Learning can be direct, where students directly assist individuals in the community or serve in the agency’s quarters such as tutoring a child, preparing earned income tax credit forms for low-income clients or working in a soup kitchen. Or, Service-Learning can be indirect, where students work on behalf of a population, community concern or issue (examples include: grant-writing, community based research, program evaluations, and producing asset and other maps for policy makers and community organizations.)

Service-Learning is different from “volunteering” or “internships” in that it is more deliberately linked to educational outcomes of a particular course. Faculty grade or assess the quality and rigor of Service-Learning through student reflection (in writing essays, group discussion, projects, and a portfolio) as well as evaluation by community partners. As one student in a Human Services course commented in a course evaluation: “Aside from the sheer quantity of assignments and reading required, the material in this course could only be understood by “doing it”."

II Service-Learning Currently at GW

GW’s location in the heart of the nation’s capital provides students and faculty access to both federal and global policy makers and institutions. This distinctive advantage can and has been used to forge important and innovative linkages in Service-Learning. GW faculty have generated novel connections that foster faculty and student research, student learning, community development, the use of new technologies and the application of these to domestic and international policy.

In the past three years, more than 30 faculty in 17 departments have integrated Service-Learning into one or more courses. Faculty in the following departments and schools have offered Service-Learning in their course offerings (Appendix I provides examples of some of the specific Service-Learning projects in certain courses).

- Biostatistics
The Impact of Service-Learning on Students

The impact of Service-Learning on the GW student experience has been significant, adding value to an educational tradition that is already rich and diverse. Some students participating in Service-Learning describe how they have gained a broader awareness of critical 21st-century issues, while others state that Service-Learning motivated them to change their academic majors and career choices. The number of students participating in Service-Learning continues to grow, as more students request a learning environment which extends beyond the traditional classroom. Throughout the 2005-2006 academic year alone, hundreds of students performed thousands of hours of Service-Learning taught by over 30 faculty members in 17 academic disciplines. In addition to connecting classroom curriculum to field work, courses that utilize Service-Learning offer students consistent reflection sessions. These sessions are important because they challenge the student to make sense of their experiences. Below are quotations from students who have participated in Service-Learning at GW. Additional student comments are found in Appendix III:

“I found this course to be academically rigorous, yet in a different way from other classes. It was a different kind of “homework” that required the use of problem solving and analysis to develop an understanding of the topics at hand. The reading assignments challenged me to think analytically, while the writing assignments taught me to combine my research, reading and site visits into comprehensive documents.”

- Student comments on course evaluation for Human Services 176, Fall 2006

“Si no estamos aquí para servir, ¿por qué existimos? He tenido una experiencia maravillosa, en que he aprendido muchísimo sobre otra gente, sobre la sociedad, sobre
mi misma, y sobre la esencia de la vida. Y al mismo tiempo he tenido la oportunidad de practicar mi español. If we are not here to serve, why do we exist? I have had a marvelous experience, where I have learned a lot about other people, about society, about myself, and about the essence of life. And at the same time, I have had the opportunity to practice my Spanish.”

- Chelsy Knight. Spanish 10, Spring 2003. Hermanos y Hermanas Mayores, Big Brothers and Big Sisters.

“ISCOVES, an interdisciplinary team service-learning experience comprised of health professional students, has enabled me to engage with an underserved and underrepresented segment of the community. This interaction has not only personalized the glaring inequities in healthcare and education that continue to exist in the Washington, DC area, but it has also presented me with a personal challenge to address these inequities as a future physician.”

- Monica Hannon, First Year Medical Student

### III Key Partners in GW’s Service-Learning Efforts

#### The Role and Support of Office of Community Service

The Office of Community Service (OCS) is the clearinghouse for Service-Learning resources at the George Washington University. OCS has and continues to advocate for a greater integration of meaningful service to the community into course curricula as a key component of an innovative and civically engaged education. OCS staff work to support Service-Learning across all academic departments by providing resources, support, and information to faculty, students, administrators and community partners.

**Support to Faculty**- The Office of Community Service supports faculty with preparation, implementation and assessment of Service-Learning initiatives for their classrooms. OCS staff help faculty modify course syllabi, connect with community partners, and track Service-Learning hours of student participants. OCS staff make class presentations addressing risk management, civic engagement reflection and any logistical issues that may arise. OCS also houses a Service-Learning lending library available to all faculty.

**Support to Students**- The Office of Community Service is the primary resource and vehicle for students to connect with community partners to complete their Service-Learning course requirements. Students work with peer leaders from OCS to a service area related to their curriculum, an appropriate community partner, and to create a schedule that meets the course requirements and students’ availability. OCS student leaders also facilitate peer reflection sessions, helping students make connections between service and learning.

Currently, the office is staffed by one half-time graduate student to coordinate Service-Learning but no dedicated professional staff hours.
The Role and Support of Community Partners

The Office of Community Service has established more than 60 campus-community partnerships with local schools, agencies, and community organizations. Faculty engaged in Service-Learning may access the Office of Community Service as a resource for identifying a community partner for Service-Learning projects. Here are some reflections by community partner representatives regarding the value and importance of GW’s Service-Learning outreach:

“The Campus Kitchens Project (CKP) is a national network of student-led hunger initiatives based on college and high school campuses. In the past 3 years, we have hosted students from GW’s Human Services Department to support our national office work in all three departments. Most significantly, GW students have submitted two grants (one funded for $5,175), created promotional materials, assisted with our annual conference, and supported our efforts to expand our network. The result? With 6 hours/week of a student’s time, our office’s capacity is increased by 5-10% during the school year. With DC Central Kitchen, students with the Neighbors Project staff one of our program components, First Helping. First Helping operates street outreach services targeting homeless populations in Washington, DC. The GW Neighbors Project secures three volunteers for each day Monday–Friday to help with this work in the Foggy Bottom area. This support reduces our volunteer coordination efforts and ensures consistent services for our clients – both leading to high quality services for our clients.”

- Radha Duggal, The Campus Kitchens Project

“Service-Learning students from the George Washington University (GW) have contributed significantly to the on-going success of programs sponsored by the Transitional Housing Corporation. Specifically, GW students serve and learn with our Youth Enrichment and Adopt-an-Apartment programs, interacting with our low-income clients transitioning into affordable housing. The significance of this interaction is truly profound, especially knowing that many of these students will be future policy makers in our government. Service-Learning creates responsible citizens and promotes a valuable dialogue among people who may not have any other opportunity to interact together. Service-Learning is Higher Education at its best.”

- Chett Pritchett, Director of Communications and Outreach, Transitional Housing Corporation

“With the help of GW Service-Learning students, Miriam’s Kitchen served a record 2,700 homeless guests in 2005. By preparing meals and supporting case management efforts, GW Service-Learning students gain an understanding of both direct action and long-term approaches to meeting the needs of some of the most vulnerable citizens of the District of Columbia. Not only do GW Service-Learning students make a real difference in our community today, but the learning they experience will inform their choices as engaged citizens of tomorrow.”

- Steve Badt, Director of Kitchen Operations and Volunteer Services, Miriam’s Kitchen
IV Future Recommendations

This section outlines the priorities for more fully integrating and developing Service-Learning at GW.

Staffing needs: The Service-Learning Advisory Board strongly endorses the funding of two full-time Service-Learning positions dedicated to supporting, coordinating and expanding Service-Learning throughout the University. One position should be a full-time faculty appointment to facilitate Service-Learning in all schools at GW at both the undergraduate and graduate level and should report directly to academic affairs. The second position should be a full-time professional staff member within the Office of Community Service to help implement the Service-Learning efforts. Both positions should have ties to academic and student support services and should strive to ensure a seamless bridge between the curricular and co-curricular sides of the University.

Providing Resources for Faculty

In a September 2006 “Faculty in Service-Learning Interest Group” meeting, more than twenty faculty members discussed ways that GW can provide enhanced and expanded resources for faculty Service-Learning.¹ The time and attention that effective Service-Learning requires demands attention and recognition from the University. Many faculty report that students have specifically asked for these experiences as part of their GW education, and it is inspiring new faculty to consider including Service-Learning in their courses. The following are specific requests from faculty to further develop and value Service-Learning at GW:

- Service-Learning should be introduced in new faculty orientation.
- Financial resources should be set aside for the ongoing training and development of faculty.
- For faculty who develop new Service-Learning projects, GW should provide either development funds or a course release.
- Service-Learning should be included and valued in tenure and promotion.
- Service-Learning should be encouraged as a venue for faculty research and publications.
- Funds should be available for faculty to attend Service-Learning conferences. In addition, supplemental funds should be made available for faculty who present Service-Learning at their own professional conferences.
- Service-Learning should also be included and valued as part of service to the university.
- Faculty request that there be a Web-based Faculty Resource Guide².
- Faculty need a forum to discuss challenges and solutions to integrating students, community and the curricular requirements.

¹ This self-select and volunteer group of faculty from diverse departments & schools still meets monthly, with hosting of the meeting on a rotation basis.
² Faculty Resource Guides for Service-Learning already exist at American University, University of Maryland, Georgetown University as well as numerous schools around the nation.
Providing Resources for Students
GW has actively promoted service in the recruitment of both undergraduates and graduates. For example, “Classroom, Campus, City” is the official GW Admissions marketing tool, featured prominently on the GW web site. The vibrant campus/DC connection is also part of Colonial Inauguration, and the number of students requesting internships and service experience continues to grow. Thus Service-Learning should become a more central part of the broader student educational experience at GW. Since many high schools, including those in the District of Columbia and Maryland, require service in order to graduate, many students who enter GW do so with the expectation of continuing their community involvement. Many have expressed dismay that more classes do not offer Service-Learning opportunities. Students have explicitly requested that GW:

- Acknowledge Service-Learning on transcripts.
- Identify courses that offer Service-Learning in the GW Bulletin.
- Provide opportunities for Service-Learning in at least one course in every major.
- Provide scholarships for students dedicated to Service-Learning (similar to the Luther Rice fellowships).
- Develop an award to recognize an outstanding student Service-Learning project.
- Consistently offer Service-Learning so that students can plan accordingly.

Expanding Partnerships
In many instances, partnerships need to be developed in ways that support faculty curriculum needs. For example, there is a need to add partners in areas that are currently under-represented, such as engineering, physical sciences, social justice, advocacy and policy organizations. The University needs to identify potential partners in these areas in order to create more meaningful learning experiences. One way to accomplish this important goal is to expand the Service-Learning outreach of all OCS programs, including the Alternative Breaks Program, DC Reads, Neighbors Project and Jumpstart.

Conclusion
In 2005, the Office of Community Service invited several faculty, students, administrators, and community partners to form a Service-Learning Advisory Board. This unofficially designated Board has worked voluntarily over the past year to guide and develop Service-Learning at GW. Several of our objectives included defining Service-Learning, and identifying the needs of faculty, students and community partners. To guide the development of Service-Learning, the Board developed a Five-Year Strategic Plan that outlines goals and objectives to advance Service-Learning. This Five-Year Plan is attached as Appendix II. The Advisory Board has met many of the objectives for Year One. The purpose of this report was to highlight what Service-
Learning has been undertaken to date at GW and how it could be further developed. We encourage you to review the plan and we invite you to meet with both the Service-Learning Advisory Board and the OCS to dialogue further. We believe that a strong foundation exists; however, more University resources and commitment are needed to realize its potential.
Appendix I: Service-Learning 5 Year Plan

George Washington University
Five-year Strategic Planning Document Outline

Year-One Benchmarks
1. Goal – Establish a Service-Learning Advisory Board
   a. Objective
      i. Identify key stakeholders
         1. Community partners
         2. Students (upper and underclassmen)
         3. Faculty
         4. Administrators-staff
      ii. Identify members-General characteristics
          1. Vice President level
          2. Person with expertise in research and assessment
          3. Faculty with community involvement in DC and from different disciplines
          4. Person well respected with teaching practices
          5. Faculty senate representative
          6. Community partners from Service-Learning sites
          7. Undergraduate students with different majors
          8. GW alumni
          9. Gender and racial diversity
      iii. Establish roles and responsibilities
           1. Identify co-chairs
           2. Identify term limits
           3. Construct plans for sub-committees

2. Goal- Define Service-Learning for GW
   a. Objectives
      i. Research definitions
         2. Consulting with Campus Compact
         3. Consulting AACC Briefs
      ii. Interview active practitioners
          1. Ms. Carrie Williams – University of Vermont
          2. Dr. Andy Furco – UC Berkeley
          3. Dr. Rudy M. Garcia – Albuquerque TVI College
          4. CoRAL
      iii. Publicize definition
           1. Post definition on website
           2. Add definition to public informational handouts
           3. Email information to faculty

3. Goal – Assess current Service-Learning practices at GW
   a. Objectives
      i. Conduct initial campus assessment
         1. Faculty (various disciplines) brown bag sessions
         2. Meet with Human Services and Sociology Professors
         3. Meet with Anne Scammon-Career Center regarding experiential education
         4. Identify list of Service-Learning faculty, courses, disciplines and colleges
Year-One Benchmarks Continued

5. Begin initial examination of student involvement including number of hours completed

4. Goal - Establish a site for the Service-Learning Program
   a. Objectives
      i. Identify space and location for Service-Learning Program
         1. Office of Community Service can act as program site
         2. Location will host Service-Learning resource materials for faculty
      ii. Develop lending “library” of resources

5. Goal - Develop program mission and vision (strategic plan)
   a. Objectives
      i. Guide Service-Learning development to match with university goals and objectives
      ii. Prioritize and establish timeline for integration of Service-Learning into the curriculum

6. Goal – Establish a report line to academic affairs
   a. Objectives
      i. Educate faculty about Service-Learning
      ii. Secure support of GW Faculty Senate
         1. Faculty Senate Committee on University and Urban Affairs

Year-Two Benchmarks

1. Goal – Develop Community Partner Service-Learning Training
   a. Objectives
      i. Design training program
         1. Who – Current community partners
         2. What – Service-Learning (Definition, Risk Management, GW Process including preparation, reflection, evaluation)
         3. Where – GW and at community sites
         4. Why – To create consistency in program and maintain quality standards
         5. How – Lecture, video, and experiential exercises
         6. When – Each summer and individual trainings when required

2. Goal – Create Campus Awareness of Service-Learning
   a. Objective
      i. Develop a Marketing Plan
         1. Create brochure
         2. Create flyer
         3. Develop website--links between OCS, University and Urban Affairs faculty senate committee, and Academic Affairs (eventually linked to faculty senate--tenure review committee)
      ii. Conduct Class Visits
         1. Contact faculty for visits
         2. Provide Service-Learning orientation presentations

3. Goal – Conduct Faculty Service-Learning Training
   a. Objective
      i. Develop a faculty training in Fall 2006 for Spring 2007 start
      ii. Develop a faculty Spring 2007 training for a Fall 2007 start
Year - Three Benchmarks

   a. Objective
      i. Establish Benchmarks for Successful Practices Utilizing the SL Rubric
         1. Service-Learning experience integrated into curriculum as described in course syllabus
         2. Reflection incorporated into syllabus
         3. Demonstrated student learning of core competencies through assessment

2. Goal – Developing and Conducting Faculty Outreach
   a. Objectives
      i. Participate in new faculty orientations
      ii. Provide consultation to new faculty members
      iii. Present at departmental meetings
      iv. Coordinate faculty development sessions

3. Goal – Establishing Recognition Procedures for Stakeholders
   a. Objectives
      i. Faculty
         1. Letter of support to department head and VP of Academic Affairs
         2. University Presidential letter
         3. Office Certificate
         4. Media press
         5. Nomination for awards
      ii. Community
         1. Certificates
         2. Letters of support for funders
         3. Service-Learning Excellence Award
         4. Highlight on web page
      iii. Students
         1. Certificates
         2. Letter from Program Director
         3. Highlight on web page
         4. Nomination for US President Volunteer and Service Award

4. Goal – Begin Assessment of Service-Learning Development and Institutionalization Process
   a. Objective
      iv. Begin Process for Transcript Notation
      v. Outline procedures and setting criteria for Service-Learning course designation
      vi. Course Catalogue and Bulletin includes Service-Learning Listings and Class Offerings
      vii. Establish a Faculty Mentoring Program
      viii. Identify funding venues for full-time director of program
      ix. Identify funding venues for program resources
      x. Identify internal and external funding sources
      xi. Expand database reporting capabilities on Service-Learning efforts
      xii. Collaborate with Computing Services to develop Blackboard use for posting Service-Learning material, information, and reflections.
Year-Five Benchmarks

1. Goal – Secure Institutional funding
   a. Objectives
      i. University provides funding for director and program operations

2. Goal – Complete Assessment of Service-Learning Development and Institutionalization Process
   a. Objectives
      i. Direct report to Academic Affairs
      ii. Service-Learning option within each college
      iii. Notations on student transcripts
      iv. Course Catalogue and Bulletin includes Service-Learning Listings and Class Offerings
      v. Advisory Board recognized as standing committee
      vi. Service-Learning taken into account in Tenure Review Process
      vii. Analyze and assess effectiveness of Service-Learning for publication and presentation purposes as well as for future direction of program.

3. Goal – Expand Service-Learning Network
   a. Objectives
      i. Mini-grants for faculty
      ii. Developing Community Partner Mentoring Program
      iii. Joint faculty/agency presentations, publications and research
      iv. Presentations at National Conferences


Appendix II: Selected Examples of Service-Learning at GW

**Human Services:** Students apply principles of non-profit management to community identified needs by conducting program evaluations and grant-writing for community partner organizations. Students also work at pre-schools and elementary schools, providing tutoring and one-on-one mentoring while learning about childhood development. In addition, they serve at a number of sites that house senior citizens, providing assistance in activities of daily living.

**Sociology:** Students learn about urban sociology by studying systems of poverty and inequality not only in the literature, but also from their experience working with community organizations serving homeless and low-income clients who are striving for self-sustainability.

**Geography:** Students employ new technology such as GPS units and mapping software to carry out field studies that analyze social, environmental and political issues. In one project students conducted a mapping project that analyzed the locations of HIV clinics, organic grocery stores and various service providers for the homeless in partnership with So Others Might Eat.

**School of Medicine and Health Sciences:** Students in medicine, public health, nursing, physical therapy and physician’s assistant program provide a number of Service-Learning projects that include: blood pressure checks, conduct health information fairs, develop patient education programs, and educate health providers on translation services for immigrants.

**Spanish Literature:** Students work with Big Brothers/Big Sisters, tutoring students whose first language is Spanish.

**Writing Program:** Students researched Medicare D components and produced a “Plain English” Guide to Medicare for Iona Senior Citizens in the District. They also assisted Seniors with the sign-up process by guiding them through the internet.

**School of Public Health and Health Services:** Starting Fall 2007 each student in the graduate School of Public Health and Health Services (SPHHS) programs must complete 120 hours of practicum experience, which includes Service-Learning.

**School of Business:** Graduate students in the School of Business often do group projects with non-governmental organizations, businesses, and government agencies. Students have worked with the DC government to identify specific projects and tasks including the Boarder Baby Referral System, the Turning Points Program, the Medicaid Pended Claims Process, Unemployment Insurance Durations, the DC Infant and Toddler Care Centers, the DC Public Schools Immunization Project, and a project for the DC Economic Development Department.
Selected Service-Learning Projects

ISCOPES:

- The Whitman Walker Clinic ISCOPES team helped to develop a survey for gay and bisexual men regarding their needs in terms of HIV and STD prevention education. Students researched the prevention literature and developed a brief survey instrument on tri-fold paper that could be completed at various locations in which men who have sex with men congregate. The prevention workers at the clinic used this survey as the basis of a project, funded by the District of Columbia HIV/AIDS Administration, to assess prevention needs in the community.

Management 201, Spring 2006:

- **Website Development for a Foreign Country’s Cultural Mission in Washington, DC Project:** The goal of this project is to redesign and enhance the website to reflect the country’s culture, tradition, and heritage. Our client expressed interest in creating an improved website designed for easy navigation where students and other clients can easily find information. We utilized various programs in developing our project: Microsoft Project (schedule) – Microsoft Publisher (design) - HTML and Java (implementation) – Apple, Key Note (presentation).

  **Results:** Our team submitted the project’s final website link and summary to the client on May 1st, 2006. On May 8, 2006, our team received the client’s evaluation.

- **Process Improvement in a University’s Language Center Project:** The purpose of the project is to use process improvement methods in order to provide recommendations aimed at assisting the Language Center to achieve its objectives. This was made possible through the analysis of the information obtained.

  **Results:** After analyzing all of the data collected, our project team defined a variety of recommendations for the Language Center. Two key recommendations were: 1) Improve the marketing strategy 2) Foster collaboration among different language departments

- **Analysis and Recommendations for an International NGOs Compensation and Benefits Packages. Project:**
  - To provide a clear picture to the NGO’s management of their compensation and benefits in relation to comparable non-profit organizations.
  - To provide an accurate assessment of the opinions of employees, both in the U.S. and overseas, on their level of satisfaction, on their suggested improvements and on their understanding of how the system is designed.
  - To combine the above studies into a comprehensive, cohesive package for management to understand where it stands on this issue, both from within the organization and from outside.
  - To make recommendations for improvements to the compensation and benefits package for management’s consideration.

  **Results:** Delivered report in April 2006. Using the final report, ERI can persuade their board and donors to relax their restrictions on funding allocation for salary and benefits.
**Geography 140**, Fall 2006:
- Project: Locate and Map a variety of social services. Results: this class of 20 students completed over 40 maps for our partner, So Others Might Eat. Below is one example of a map showing several types of general services.
University Writing 20, Fall 2006:
Students researched the community history around Marvin Gaye Park and then proposed ideas to Washington Parks and People as to how to incorporate the community’s voice in the park. Below are copies of the letter and supporting materials the students provided the organization.

The George Washington University
December 14th, 2006

Washington Parks and People
Riverside Center
5200 Foote Street, NE
Washington, DC  20019

Dear Dennis Chestnut and Members of Washington Parks and People:

We, as members of The George Washington University’s freshman writing program, have been completing the service learning component of our program by working with Washington Parks and People. In the process, we completed hours of research on the impact of your organization as well as the history of the surrounding community, and we have recently conducted an interview with Alice Chandler, a longtime resident of Deanwood. We believe that the information gathered in the interview could be beneficial to your organization in the furthering of community unity and the attraction of volunteers.

Gathered in the interview with Alice Chandler is a personal perspective about growing up in Deanwood. She told us about her life and experiences living in the area, and her own memories of Watts Branch Park. As a lifetime resident, she is a valuable resource towards understanding the development of the Watts Branch community. In addition to numerous historical references to former local businesses, churches, and other groups, her insights on the causation of the community’s descent into drugs and subsequent recovery speaks directly to Washington Parks and People. Ms. Chandler attributes the improvement of Deanwood and its surrounding neighborhoods to increased community activism, including the work of Washington Parks and People.

We believe Washington Parks and People could use the information set forth in the interview as a resource for connecting with the surrounding community and explaining the organization to future volunteers and contributors. Through the creation of a video presentation, one could strengthen the ties that Washington Parks and People has to its local residents, who, we have discovered, aren’t always aware of the workings of the organization. There are likely many members of the local community that aren’t familiar with the work that Washington Parks and People has done at all. By interviewing community members and compiling a small oral history, word of mouth could increase local awareness to events and improvements sponsored and facilitated by the organization. We have personally seen the rapid improvement in Watts Branch Park, most recently with the construction of an amphitheater and the installation of a fitness trail. Think about how many more local residents might show up at amphitheater events if they knew how dedicated the organization was to their community.

By being asked to participate in the oral history, documented on video for full visual effect, Washington Parks and People will be directly engaging community residents, a goal we are well aware your organization takes seriously. Your organization prides itself on its yearly Fourth of July gatherings, community events at the Riverside center, and other such activities that
embrace local residents. An audio-visual oral history would be one more project that the organization and community could collaborate on, and the result would be a piece of history that encapsulates the whole residential area.

As a class, we watched a video introducing the programs instituted at a local homeless shelter; the video talked about the homeless facility’s poetry program, which allowed people to work through their problems through their writing. We found the video both engaging and motivating. A visual presentation is therefore an effective tool of volunteer recruitment that could be used at universities, church groups, and civic organizations. In the creation of a possible video presentation, Washington Parks and People would be greatly benefited in their goal of broadening a permanent volunteer base. In addition, the video presentation could be shown for the purpose of soliciting donations from larger corporations.

The video presentation could be highlighted by the creation of a map. As a group, we found it a bit difficult to follow Alice Chandler as she took us through an auditory tour of the Lincoln Heights/Deanwood area. People who aren’t part of the neighborhood would be able to understand the area in which they would be volunteering through the use of a comparison map; the map ideally would show the development and evolution of the area from the 1950s onward, and promote a better understanding of the area’s diverse history. Washington Parks and People might consider working with the Deanwood Historical Society to gather more facts about former local businesses and institutions. Again, working with another local community group will further Washington Parks and People’s overarching goal of reaching out to others in cooperative projects. Both of these visual presentations could be future projects for Washington Parks and People to work in tandem with university writing students at The George Washington University in the following semesters.

Our group had an enjoyable experience both personally volunteering with and researching your organization. This interview, and hopefully many more to come, can serve as the basis for a historically comparative map, an explanatory video, and an oral history of the area. All of these components will help with Washington Parks and People’s goal of heightening ties to the local community, all the while creating opportunities to expand its volunteer base. Alice Chandler’s and other residents’ perspectives will help volunteers feel more connected to what they are accomplishing, and will also help the community feel more connected to Washington Parks and People. There is no reason to embark on such an endeavor alone; we believe that the solicitation of both local historical societies and future university writing students at The George Washington University would be favorable to the completion of such projects. We want to see Washington Parks and People succeed in the revitalization of DC parks and waterways, but most of all, we want to see such accomplishments facilitated by the cooperation of local community members and external volunteers.

Sincerely,
University Writing Group M19

Samantha Barry, David Frantz, and Nicole Kornspan
sbarry@gwu.edu, defrantz@gwu.edu, kornspan@gwu.edu
**Key Passages**

00:05:12

**Alice Chandler:** “And we used to have horses come through on Sundays easily. The Lancasters had horses and we would see them ride through, ... we didn’t think of it as being rural, but, you know, to see what people see out on the farm and then when you would go out on Sheriff Road you would see tobacco farms and other things at that time. Yeah, so when I was your age they still had tobacco farms and now of course you have Metro stations pouring out of the Capitol and four and six lane highways and stuff—

**Sam Barry:** I wonder when that started taking place? That kind of transformation, when did that start happening?

**Alice Chandler:** Around the 1960s, end of the 60s. By the time I went to college, I remember, when I was 12, I remember seeing Martin Luther King when it was only a two-lane street at the corner of 49th and what was then...Dean Avenue. Because when you crossed the street it became Grant Street. And he was there and I remember one of my neighbors took me there, he said, “He’s a very famous man, not here, but he’s leading all of these things.”

00:06:18

00:06:58

**Alice Chandler:** We didn’t think of it as rural, but it was basically rural. I mean Woodson Senior High School was not there, that was a big field. Mary School was made up of barracks, where you see this school over here—both these schools are all concrete and stuff but that was just a big field. The one at 50th Street near where there was formerly an amusement park, I don’t remember it but my mother and other people, older people remember going to it. Do you know anything about Glen Echo—it would be the equivalent of your Six Flags and everything. So that’s what they had there. That’s what they had there and they were for the black men who were returning from the military. They built these homes for them.

00:07:38

These passages described the rural background of Deanwood and the Watts Branch Park community. It provides a brief history and illustrates the development and expansion of the area over the years. Deanwood was not always the urban setting that it appears to be. It has a unique history that should be more known about – which may be achieved through a coalition between Washington Parks and People and the Deanwood Historical Society.

00:08:20

**Sam Barry:** Do you remember any ... local businesses in the area that might have had an effect on—

**Alice Chandler:** Yes, the Parkers that are now on Sheriff, ... about 45th, 46th and Sheriff Road...I remember they were on roughly what was Castle and I think is 49th Place or something now. It was Castle and Dean Avenue. And then, of course, I remember when I was even smaller when you go back over towards closer to where Dennis is there was Rollins Funeral Home. So there were a series of funeral homes around there. And where Rollins was, why I remember that specifically because there was an acrobat group that lived in the area, Lincoln Heights, and seven of them got killed while they were, you know, on tour. And we went in there to see them because some of the kids went to school with us. Now Dennis wasn’t with me at the time, and that’s why I remember because I remember I was screaming and hollering once I went inside, you know coming out at six it was like getting dark or something. But I do remember that. So Rollins was there, Menicks Market was there. I don’t know I think it’s called Lee’s Market at 44th and Nannie Helen Burroughs now. That was there. I can’t tell you about Suburban Liquors because I didn’t go to the liquor store so...there was Spic N Span that’s diagonal from the BP
station on Nannie Helen Burroughs. That was our grocery store. And I don’t remember the
gentleman’s name but it was Jewish-owned. And many of the stores in that area were owned by,
you know, Jewish individuals, until, until the Safeway came. And I must have been about 10
years old when the Safeway came at about, that’s at 51st and Nannie Helen Burroughs across
from Sarge Memorial Church, which was one of the churches that have been in the area. It has
since expanded. That church you see there now is not the church we went to—it, that was just a
little thing over on the side and then eventually they expanded. That was really a real
commercial shopping area, between 51st and Hayes, and over to where the, and Division. That
was where we had hardware stores, we had drugstores—I believe there were two drugstores just
on Division Avenue. I don’t know if you’ve ever heard of Pie’s Ice Cream Store? ... there was an
ice cream store called Pie’s. Then eventually it became a record store, because they kept getting
robbed eventually, and so it became a record store by the time I was in—I think by the time I was
in college or when I first started working in the 1970s. Late, you know, early 70s. But that was
really, you know, outside of Minnesota Avenue, because when I was very young it was still very
segregated. ... The Strand Theater, which was at Division and what was then Division and Grant
Street.

_Sam Barry_: So right around Division was really the—

_Alice Chandler_: That was the place. In fact, we even had a small satellite post office. A little
variety store. As I said, we had two drugstores. We had two hardware stores. At one time they
even had a credit union when Marshall Heights first opened we saw a credit union there. Around
the 70s or so. I believe it was around the 70s.

00:11:58

This passage details the specific locations of businesses that were prominent or that still exist
in the community. Using this information, it is possible to sketch a map of what the Watts
Branch Park area once looked like. It demonstrates the economic conditions during that
period in comparison to the current situation. Once again it reveals the growth of the
community and the potential it has to continue that development.

00:15:23

_Sam Barry_: I think we were near East Capitol actually.

_Alice Chandler_: Okay. That used to be one of the largest public housing places. One thousand
people they just moved out within the last five years and they built what they’re building and it’s
now mixed income. And nobody’s really, you know, upset about it because it had become a
horrible, you know, place where drugs and other things took place. What else?

_Sam Barry_: Was there any move to renovate the area? Or...

_Alice Chandler_: I think when it really made its crash was after the riots in ’68. That was really
the turning point. You have a number of people, of course, as the income and education became
better for blacks, they moved into what is now the richest county for black people, Prince
Georges County.

00:16:09

00:18:35

_Alice Chandler_: Dean was a plantation owner. Gave substantial amount of his land to his
former slaves. And some of them still have land that has come down through their family that
they got upon emancipation of slaves here in 1862.

00:18:50

00:19:18

_David Frantz_: I know you had mentioned that there was a train that went through? When did
that ... when did they take that down?
**Alice Chandler:** Oh, it must have stopped around the late, around in the 70s, maybe the early, between the 70s and 80s. Because when you come out Nannie Helen Burroughs now you see a series of houses. And where those houses were, the train used to come back at about half a block, block from my house, and it would go out towards Annapolis. Many times though it used to turn out at Watkins which was right at, you would call it Martin Luther King Highway? It used to be called George Palmer Highway which was named for the adjoining plantation that was to some of the places in the area.

This passage shows how Deanwood's history was affected by racial segregation, and as speaks of a history that is not well known. Because this area has a rich history, people outside the community may be interested in helping with the upkeep of this valuable area, and thus influencing the condition of the neighborhood.

00:20:51

**Sam Barry:** A lot of our research, since we were looking through The Washington Post and things like that, centered on, um, more recent crime in the area in the 80s and the 90s, and we were wondering if you could offer your perspective on that and how the region overcame ... that?

**Alice Chandler:** Well, when I was little, I remember we could get into cars or get onto streetcars, go downtown, leave our houses open like they do in Vermont, and Maine and other places, I mean just totally open, and no one would come into your house at all. I remember the first time my mother changed the locks on our house, her handbag was stolen while she was uptown at church, at Metropolitan Baptist Church. And I was a little girl, maybe about 10 years old. And that, from that point, so if I was 10, about 1959, was when people began to maybe take stock of beginning to lock up. But it was still not the fear factor that you had—the fear factor seemed to come with the drugs right after the riots during the late 60s, early 70s, and that's when the change came that way. We still have a lot of influx of people from the outside who come in, say New York especially—(jokingly) I hate the people in New York—but they tend to seem like, New York, people have always lived in public housing, since the 70s, which was a whole different public housing than we understood. Because it was an honor to be in public housing at one time. Lincoln Heights was not the place you know of now. It was a place where, it was very commonly—it wasn’t something that you feared. But the whole drug industry turned up everything in this city primarily.

This passage offers an insider’s perspective on the issues currently afflicting the Watts Branch Park community. It shows the differences in safety before the riots of the 1960s, and how it was changed afterward. It is an honest opinion from someone who truly knows the area. There is often many misunderstands about this topic and Alice Chandler’s views have the power to inform and allow people understand the reality of the situation.
Project 4 Indexes

Index One: Index by Time Stamp

1. Growing up in Deanwood (00:00:09)
2. “Rural” nature of the community (00:04:38)
3. Transformation of community in the 60s, mentions MLK (00:05:46)
4. Amusement park, housing, post-Vietnam (00:07:20)
5. Local Businesses and development (00:08:23)
6. Competition between western and eastern DC schools (00:13:50)
7. Education and public housing (00:14:56)
8. Plantation history and linkage (00:18:38)
9. Public transportation (00:19:22)
10. Personal education and that of locales (00:20:08)
11. Crime, drugs, public housing, and the riots (00:20:51)
12. Washington Parks and People, community civic associations, and the ANC (00:22:40)
13. Police participation and involvement (00:24:09)
14. Improvement in Watts Branch Park (00:26:20)

Index Two: Chronological

1. Plantation history and linkage (00:18:38)
2. Amusement park (00:07:20)
3. Growing up in Deanwood (00:00:09)
4. “Rural” nature of the community (00:04:38)
5. Local Businesses and development (00:08:23)
6. Public transportation (00:19:22)
7. Mentions MLK (00:05:55)
8. Transformation of community in the 60s (00:05:46)
9. Crime, drugs, public housing, and the riots (00:20:51)
10. Housing, post-Vietnam (00:07:33)
11. Education and public housing (00:14:56)
12. Police participation and involvement (00:24:09)
13. Competition between western and eastern DC schools (00:13:50)
14. Personal education and that of locales (00:20:08)
15. Washington Parks and People, community civic associations, and the ANC (00:22:40)
16. Improvement in Watts Branch Park (00:26:20)

Index Three: Theme

1. Growing up in Deanwood (00:00:09)
2. “Rural” nature of the community (00:04:38)
3. Plantation history and linkage (00:18:38)
4. Amusement park (00:07:20)
5. Local Businesses and development (00:08:23)
6. Public transportation (00:19:22)
7. Transformation of community in the 60s, mentions MLK (00:05:46)
8. Crime, drugs, public housing, and the riots (00:20:51)
9. Police participation and involvement (00:24:09)
10. Competition between western and eastern DC schools (00:13:50)
11. Education and public housing (00:14:56)
12. Housing, post-Vietnam (00:07:33)
13. Personal education and that of locales (00:20:08)
14. Washington Parks and People, community civic associations, and the ANC (00:22:40)
15. Improvement in Watts Branch Park (00:26:20)

Background Information

Suburban Gardens: (00:07:18)
Suburban Gardens was a seven-acre amusement park that was open between 1921 and 1940. It was located by the neighborhood of Deanwood, at 50th and Hayes Streets NE. As this was a period of racial segregation, this amusement park served only African-Americans. Currently, the space for Suburban Gardens is being used for Merritt Elementary School.

Post-WWII Veteran Housing: (00:07:38)
Following the Second World War, the G.I. Bill, allowed for returning soldier to purchase home and live “the American Dream.” Low cost homes were built in affordable suburban neighborhoods across the country (including the area around Watts Branch) and soldiers bought these homes on reduced mortgage rates. The majority of these homes still stand today and are still used.

School Competition (00:13:50)
The conflict between the western and eastern schools in Washington, DC that Ms. Chandler alludes to is held up with research. By comparing the SAT reading scores among DC public schools, the top 10 average scores were found. Zip code results: (2)20001(northwest), 20037(northwest), 20019(east), 20016 (northwest), 20007(northwest), (3)20011(northwest), 20020(southeast). Out of the top 10 public schools in Washington, DC, only one of them is on the eastern side of the city.

New East Capitol Public Housing: (00:15:22)
In 2000, the D.C. Housing Authority began the redevelopment of two public housing developments (East Capitol Dwellings and Capital View Plaza) as well as an adjacent vacant lot. Once complete, New East Capitol will have 515 new units (96 public housing units, 262 affordable or market rate units, and 157 will be home ownership units). The development will also feature assisted living, commercial retail, daycare, and other services supporting the community. Located on East Capitol Street and Southern Avenue in Ward 7.

Riots of 1968: (00:15:50)
In response to the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., people protested nationwide in over 110 cities. The cities most heavily damaged were Chicago, Washington D.C., and Baltimore. These riots impacted the D.C.’s economy with the closing of various businesses, loss of thousands of jobs, and crime levels increased.

Urban Foresters: (00:25:25)
The D.C. Urban Forestry Administration plants and maintains trees within the District. These include street trees as well as those within city parks.

Glossary of Local Businesses and Organizations

Howard Woodson Senior High School – Established in 1972. 5500 Eads Street, NE Washington, DC 20019
Merritt Elementary School - 5002 Hayes St NE Washington, DC 20019

Burrville Elementary School - 801 Division Ave NE Washington, DC 20019

Tabernacle Baptist Church – 719 Division Ave NE Washington, DC 20019

Pilgrim Land Baptist Church – 5119 Nannie Helen Burroughs Ave Washington, DC 20019

Rollins Funeral Home – Established in 1961. 4339 Hunt Place, NE Washington, DC 20019

Henry S. Washington and Sons Funeral Home - 4925 Nannie Helen Burroughs Ave Washington, DC 20019

Sonny’s Amoco - 5207 Nannie H Burroughs Ave NE Washington, DC 20019

Menick’s Market – Still standing, not a Lee’s Market. 4401 Nannie Helen Burroughs Avenue, NE Washington, DC 20019

Barnett’s Bakery – now a trash transfer station

Suburban Liquors – 4347 Hunt Place, NE Washington, DC 20019

Strand Theatre – Note, there is currently a Strand Liquors store at the corner of Division and Nannie Helen Burroughs Ave., but no theater, according to an interactive internet map. According to Washington Parks and People, the theater and BP station do still exist at that corner.

Marshall Heights Community Development Organization – 3939 Benning Road, NE Washington, DC 20019
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Appendix III: Student Reflections on Service-Learning

“During high school I volunteered once a week tutoring a thirteen year old girl in math. Needless to say she didn’t listen to a thing I said and it was one of the most frustrating experiences I have had. Last semester as part of my course requirements, I worked at For the Love of the Children (FLOC) tutoring for a thirteen year old boy. The thirty hours of tutoring I did was a supplement to a child development course. This experience was far more rewarding because I was able to take what I learned during class and design lessons that would hold his attention. I couldn’t help but feel proud of myself and my student after a successful session because I knew we had both worked hard to make the most out of our three-hour session.”

- Julie Chaiken, GW student, class of 2008

“The first time I experienced a “check-in” was during my Human Service 152 course. I was hesitant at first to explain to the class that I wasn’t enjoying my site. In my mind, I thought volunteers were supposed to love their placements simply because of the good they were doing for the organization and community. This course helped me gain an understanding of the reality of burnout and how important it is to talk about our experiences. Those individuals who are not able to partake in Service-Learning courses during their college experience are really missing out, especially being in the nation’s capital.”

- Abigail Page, GW student, class of 2008

“Service-Learning courses mirror the structure of my two semester experience with AmeriCorps, which developed my leadership, collaborative abilities, understanding of diversity, and my social erudition. In high school and at GW, I attend various volunteer activities that last a few hours. While they are important, they cannot match the incredible impact of Service-Learning courses. With an entire semester in one middle school, I literally became a recognizable member of that community; therefore, I had the necessary relationship to increase student achievement, assist teachers, and organize new community-building initiatives. Plus, I had the support of the staff and the opportunities to reflect, which enhanced my efficacy and knowledge. The experiences of my service have been instrumental in my academic and personal success at GW. It was very rewarding to learn while serving. The knowledge I acquired accentuates nearly everything I do in college. It has made me prouder to be a GW student.”

- Zachary Maurin, GW student, class of 2007

“Ellos fueron mis estudiantes, pero la verdad es que ellos me enseñaron mucho más de lo que yo les enseñé. Ellos son mis maestros, mi amigos y mi estímulo. They were my students, but the truth is that they taught me much more than what I taught them. They are my teachers, my friends and my encouragement.”

“The Mapping project for our client, So Others Might Eat, was a unique experience that pushed me to visit a part of Washington where I would never venture. At the same time, it was a chance to learn more about and aid an underserved part of the community. It is this type of active learning that enriches education and makes the process enjoyable.

The mapping project helped me visualize urban problems like poverty and safety. Although readings on homelessness, poverty, urban design and safety are interesting, there is no experience like seeing these urban problems first hand. Because of this project I explored a new part of the city. It gave me a chance to visit one of the most secluded, homogeneous and disenfranchised communities in our nation. In this part of the city, roads just end, like a no-man’s land. The city just disappears and becomes nothing. At the same time, it is alive and exciting in the face of poverty and age.”

- John Plack, Geography 140 student, Fall 2006

“I learned a lot about the homeless situation here in Washington, D.C. Through the speakers we had discuss and share their knowledge with us in class and then with the research I conducted on finding the services I was looking for, I ended up learning about why and how people become homeless, the problems they face, ways that these services try to help them, etc. I also was given the knowledge of the details that go into the planning, organization and implementation that it takes to create the services to help the homeless with these problems and others.

The greatest thing I learned from the mapping project, however, was what I saw when I was driving around parts of the city that I would never find myself in. By doing this I was seeing things that we had discussed in class and found that my partner and I were talking about them and referring to what we had been reading and discussing in class. Driving through one section of D.C., I stated how there seemed to be an outbreak in construction of condos on both sides of the streets for a number of blocks. He agreed and then I stated, “hey didn’t we talk about that in class?” That was the perfect example of knowledge leaving the classroom. The project also put the reality of homelessness into effect. At one of the services we stopped at there were a number of homeless people lined up outside waiting to get in, and that brought the realization that we weren’t just mapping a building on our GPS but we were mapping a building that was offering warmth and shelter to those homeless who were so desperately seeking it.”

- Brandi Kerrigan, Geography 140 student, Fall 2006

“I looked at the Service-Learning project as just one more assignment that I had to complete before the end of the semester, but as I dove into it and really got out in the city, I was amazed at how much I didn’t know. I learned a lot throughout the semester about the diversity of the urban landscape from writers such as Levy, Knox, Short, Mitchell, etc., but actually going out into the city and applying the knowledge that I acquired made what I took from the classroom a reality. Washington, DC, is such a diverse city with rich and poor, white and black, old and young. I get so caught up in my little GW bubble with people just like me and I forget that there is so much more to the city than the Foggy Bottom neighborhood. I have to say that I was none too excited to start the mapping project, but after I began, I realized that this was a priceless experience in which I was able to see the city in a new light. I began to see that a mapping project from my geography class could help make a difference in the lives of
many people. From going out into the city to gather waypoints to sitting in the lab
generating the maps, my perspectives of Washington, DC have been dramatically
changed and numerous correlations between homeless shelters and the environment in
which they are found have been revealed to me.

Washington, DC, is full of amazing people and I never realized how diverse the
neighborhoods are until this mapping project. This mapping project taught me a lot
academically about geography and the urban landscape as well as a lot about what I can
be doing to get outside my own box to make the world better.”

• Chad Jordan, Geography 140 student, Fall 2006

"For those interested in the allied health professions, ISCOPEs is a rare program. The
collaboration between so many disciplines serves as a huge benefit not only to the
residents of the District, but to the personal and professional education of the students
who participate in it. From both a public health and clinical medicine perspective, I
found it to be incredibly useful at bridging the gap between the needs of the underserved
and the unique skills of GW's public health professionals."

• Jeremiah Davis, Joint Program: Master of Public Health and Second year
  Medicine

“I absolutely believe in the value of service learning. Collaborating with students from
other programs has enhanced my appreciation for the roles of other providers with
whom I will serve and the variety of perspectives from which an issue (ex. health
literacy) can be addressed by different practitioners. From a practical standpoint, this
experience has also been a good lesson in the challenges of implementing real-world,
viable projects (coordinating numerous schedules, patient v. provider priorities, budget
constraints, IRB requirements and other policy issues), as well as instructional in what
characteristics and approaches do and do not work well when facilitating group
meetings and developing community-based projects.”

• Marie P. White, Physician Assistant and Master of Public Health Student (Joint
  Program) First year

“I feel strongly that the opportunity for being in direct contact with the community and
its members has made my learning more "real" for me. While learning from theoretical
models and other classroom experiences is certainly important for setting a foundation,
getting into the community has been an important next step; working with community
has helped blend theory with practical application. The ISCOPEs experience has been
insightful for understanding limitations, barriers, and complexities as well as
possibilities of intervening and making a positive impact in communities.”

• Patricia Lucas, Nurse Practitioner Consortium Student (GW and George Mason
  University Collaborative Program)
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REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
March 9, 2007

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting with Elliot Hirshman

The University’s Chief Research Officer, Elliot Hirshman has met with the Executive Committee to discuss the University’s Strategic Plan for Research. Pursuant to that discussion, the Executive Committee has arranged for Dr. Hirshman to provide a report on the Strategic Plan for Research to the Faculty Senate at the April meeting.

Faculty Senate Committee on Advancement

As reported, the Executive Committee has had a discussion with Vice President for Advancement Laurel Price Jones regarding the merits of establishing an Advancement Committee of the Faculty Senate.

At its February meeting the Executive Committee agreed to have Professors Wilmarth and Robinson prepare a draft of a by-laws resolution which would recommend that the Faculty Senate establish a Standing Committee on Advancement.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Grievances

The two grievances, one in Columbian College and the other in the School of Business continue in process. The appeal has been heard in the first and the decision is pending. In the School of Business the case is still in hearing.

Nonconcurrences

No administrative nonconcurrences have been received by the Executive Committee, to date.

APRIL SENATE MEETING

Agenda for the April Meeting

On March 30th the Executive Committee will meet to establish the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting on April 9.

The election of the Chair and Members of the Executive Committee for the 2007-2008 session of the Senate will take place at the April 13th meeting.
At the April 13th meeting the Executive Committee will be proposing list of nominees for membership on the Dispute Resolution Committee and Administrative Committees.

Please also note that the annual photograph of the Senate will also be taken on April 13.

**NEXT MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for March 30. Resolutions, reports and any other matters should be submitted in advance of that meeting.