

Charge to the Working Groups for Development of The George Washington University Strategic Plan

Introduction

The George Washington University is at a critical time in its history. It has evolved into one of the nation's leading universities in many areas and has the potential for moving into the group of truly elite institutions of higher education. The combination of GW's unique location, accomplished faculty, talented students and strong financial structure opens up opportunities for us to more fully achieve General Washington's vision for a national university that educates the next generation of citizen leaders.

Our university's goals for the coming decade are in one sense ambitious and in another sense straightforward; they revolve around the long-standing, three-part mission of education, the advancement of knowledge through research, and service to society. More specifically, our strategic plan must embrace a vision that includes:

- Preparing our students to be national and world leaders in dealing with the challenges and opportunities they will encounter throughout their lifetimes;
- Advancing human knowledge in ways that have significant positive effects on the human condition;
- Creating a strong identity for the university as a world leader in the areas we select as strategically important.

Elevating the quality of our teaching, research and service to society will happen only if we make well-informed choices about how we use our resources in the coming decade. No university, no matter how well located or financed, can be all things to all people. In addition, the financial, regulatory, demographic and technological environment in which GW must thrive is likely to change over time; therefore we must make choices that take advantage of our strengths and that position GW for greatness in a changing world. These observations motivate our strategic plan for the coming decade. In this document, we set forth what we expect to achieve from a strategic plan, how we envision the world changing and how we will accommodate such changes, and the major strategic themes we believe will serve as the pillars upon which we will build GW's future excellence.

Our Approach to Strategic Planning

The plan described in this document strives to meet several distinct and sometimes conflicting criteria. For example, a plan for an organization as complex as The George Washington University should not endeavor to be all-inclusive. As we move into the last decade of our second century, our university has become extraordinarily diverse in all its aspects. Any reasonable strategic plan needs to leave ample room for the wide range of intellectual pursuits and academic programs our faculty and students will undertake. For this reason, we have chosen to create a plan that selects a small number of major themes on which we will focus a considerable portion of our resources, while also

acknowledging that a great university such as ours will continue to invest in programs and initiatives that do not always specifically align with these selected themes. In this way, this plan will provide broad guidance about our overall priorities to everyone in our community without overly constraining what each of us does.

We believe that it is time for a plan that moves beyond identifying many separate, disconnected foci of expertise. To be sure, excellence requires us to have individual units, faculty, and students who achieve national recognition. And the university must and will continue to invest disproportionately in those individuals and organizational elements that are world-leading. But top universities must also strive to be known for more than just world-class programs; they also need a common thread that unifies the strengths and talents of the university.

We expect that GW's individual schools and research institutes will develop strategic plans that are guided by the overall university plan. These school plans will likely be much more detailed and may indeed focus on departments and centers of excellence. Some of the school-based priorities should link to the university's overall priorities, but some may reflect distinctive aspects of each school that are not all completely determined by the priorities in the university's plan. At GW, as at other top institutions of higher education, the university-wide strategic plan needs to leave room for our schools, departments and research institutes and centers to make informed choices with local resources.

It is important that our plan for the coming decade delineate some clear strategic choices about what we should do, and equally important, what we should not attempt. Because the selected strategic themes are by design very broad, we have described specific initiatives for each theme in the areas of *research, education, outreach* and our own *institutional structure*. We envision the strategic plan as establishing a framework for making wise choices about the commitment of our resources in each of these four domains that are aligned with advancing GW's programs and reputation in each of the thematic areas we select. These strategic investments will establish GW as among the small number of world-renowned universities in the thematic areas. Ideally, the successful execution of the strategic plan will result in our selected themes becoming the "signature" of GW in the sense that we will be known throughout the world as leaders in these areas.

An effective strategic plan should also build on our university's particular characteristics, reflecting our specific strengths and acknowledging areas of less strength. We have avoided as much as possible generic statements that might apply equally well to many of our peers. Instead, our plan leverages attributes such as our unique location in the District of Columbia, the strength of our faculty and academic programs in key areas, and existing and potential partnerships with other institutions. It is also based on a realistic assessment of our limitations so that we focus our resources on initiatives that are not only important but where there is a reasonable probability of success. The plan should not only explore how we should allocate existing resources, but also examine areas where there are excellent prospects for new funding from philanthropy and sponsored research.

In developing this plan, we have taken into account the major global, national and local trends that will, over the coming decade, shape the environment in which GW must succeed. We cannot assume that the world of tomorrow will be exactly like the world of today. Instead, we have built a plan that we believe will position GW for the future as best as we can envision it.

Finally, because our predictions about the future could easily be mistaken, the proposed plan cannot remain static over a ten-year interval. The plan develops strategies that we think are best for us based on what we know today. At the same time, we must be alert and be prepared to alter these strategies if the future evolves differently from what we now anticipate.

Envisioning the Future

Our planning process began with envisioning societal changes likely to occur that will affect higher education in general and The George Washington University in particular. This effort, sometimes called “strategic visioning,” identifies six trends that, if they continue, will create both new opportunities and new challenges for us. Most important, assuming that the trends we have identified continue, they provide a context for how we want to position our university over the coming decade and beyond to best elevate the quality and impact of the research, teaching and service activities we undertake. In this way we will maximize GW’s contribution to society at large and to the District of Columbia region, the nation and the world.

Globalization – Our world is highly interconnected and becomes more so each day. As technological advances have made communication and travel easier, less expensive, and more accessible to the majority of people on the planet, the world has rapidly become a global community. This global accessibility has far-reaching implications for a wide range of interests and activities. For example, corporate structures reflect the increasing globalization of economic activities. We envision that economic growth will be greatest in emerging economies rather than developed countries, particularly in China, Brazil and India. The increasing interdependency of national economies poses new challenges and opportunities that demand fundamental changes in policy. Universities need to be prepared to take the best possible advantage of how globalization can improve their research and educational enterprises.

Demographics – Changes in global demographics include aging populations in the United States, Europe, Japan and other developed economies, combined with rapid growth in young populations in developing countries and the consequent growth in demand for higher education from those countries. Within the U.S., the current rate of growth of minority populations indicates that they will constitute an increasing proportion of the population in the coming decades. These changing demographics present challenges and opportunities for our nation’s universities to educate new generations of students who will often have very different backgrounds and personal experiences than earlier generations.

Resource constraints – As the population of the world continues to grow, and as rapidly developing countries continue to increase their consumption of energy, raw materials and agricultural products to approach consumption levels of already-developed countries, there is increasing concern about the sustainability of the environment. Prices for scarce resources are likely to continue to rise, creating an increased demand for energy resources, water resources, agricultural commodities and raw materials resulting in a greater need for more sustainable production and consumption practices. In addition, for countries such as the United States, which are major importers of some of these materials (notably fossil fuel energy), there will be growing concerns about the national security consequences of being dependent on imports from a small group of exporting countries. Research and education programs at GW that focus on issues related to resource constraints will be of growing importance in the future.

Governance Issues – National and international institutions have become increasingly strained in coping with challenges in international finance and governance. The strain is manifested in diverse ways, such as the difficulties the U.S. faces in balancing debt reduction and economic growth, the Euro Zone crisis, slow economic growth in developed countries, failed states that can no longer govern their respective territories and the potential breakdown of international efforts to control nuclear proliferation. Similarly, long-standing systems such as the provision of health care in the U.S. are increasingly challenged. We need both better policies to address crucial issues such as health care and governance systems that can translate these policies into politically acceptable and effective actions.

Higher Education – Governments at all levels and the public more generally are increasingly questioning the rising cost of higher education. This is likely to create pressure for lower tuition growth rates. Much of this pressure may affect public universities that in recent years have had far larger percentage increases in their respective tuitions than selective private universities. Nevertheless, there is likely to be great sensitivity to having tuition grow faster than inflation. This may manifest itself in increasing political sensitivity or, in the extreme, forms of price control that link access to federal and state financial aid to slower growth in tuition levels. The attention to high tuition (both nominal and net of financial aid) is likely to feed the debate over the economic value of a college education. This attention will likely come from many quarters, including parents and regulatory agencies such as the Department of Education, which in turn may create demand for greater measurement of educational outcomes, job placement records and other metrics.

We also anticipate a rapid expansion of higher education institutions outside the U.S., particularly in large countries with high GDP growth rates such as India, Brazil and China. In some cases, this growing investment in higher education outside the U.S. will produce a new tier of competing universities that may draw some portion of the population that formerly considered selective U.S. universities a first choice, particularly for graduate education.

Technology – The rapid pace of advances in computation and communication technologies will likely continue for the foreseeable future. Much of the innovation and adoption of new technologies will almost certainly involve mobile communications. The next generation of students will expect access to high-speed connectivity on a wide range of devices such as smart phones, tablets and e-readers, and they will expect that connectivity to be ubiquitous. There will likely be widespread adoption of various forms of what we now call “cloud computing” that allow students seamless access to files and software from different devices they own. On the positive side, these technologies will enable many forms of distance learning that break down some of the limitations in course scheduling (both in terms of when and where students learn). However, universities will be continuously challenged to leverage these possibilities in ways that have positive educational outcomes.

Our Strengths and Limitations

Our university has built substantial strengths over its 190-year history. At the same time, there are areas in which we have not invested and in which we therefore may not be well positioned to compete with other top-tier universities. Given our relatively modest financial resources for a private university of our size, we have decided that we will have the greatest opportunities for success if we focus our resources on, and pursue new revenue sources in the coming decade for, areas that leverage our strengths, rather than attempting to catch up to competitors in areas in which we have traditionally not been among the leaders.

Location – Our location in the heart of the nation’s capital is one of our university’s greatest assets. At its most fundamental level, our unique location places us next door to the center of our country’s decision-making processes and to the headquarters of many international organizations. The consequences of this are great. Our faculty and students are able to – and do – forge partnerships with many of these federal decision-making agencies and international organizations. Because of our location, we are able to provide a very large range of internship opportunities for students and to collaborate in a variety of ways with government and international organizations. Our collaborations are not limited to governmental bodies; rather, they include institutions involved in the performing and visual arts, in history, and in the sciences.

While we have a separate campus in Loudon County, Virginia (as well as three other learning centers in that state), GW’s Foggy Bottom main campus gives us a distinctly urban identity that we need to remember as we make future strategic decisions. For example, while we cover a very wide range of disciplines, we quite naturally have not invested in areas such as agricultural science that are more often prominent in public, land-grant universities. Our students are drawn to GW to be part of the exciting, energetic and broadly diverse D.C. environment, and our urban identity is often a major factor in why they choose to study here. Finally, because our land area in the District is limited and our student body in the city is subject to limits imposed by the local government, we cannot grow enrollments on campus in any areas without decreasing enrollments in others. This means that any overall growth in our student body size must happen outside

our current footprint in the District of Columbia and that we must view student enrollment in the District as a special resource that should be allocated carefully to maximize its overall value to our mission.

Major capital investments – Since moving to Foggy Bottom a century ago, GW has made enormous investments in our facilities that we should leverage in our strategy. For example, for undergraduate education, we evolved from a largely commuter-oriented university to a residential university with many residence halls within the Foggy Bottom footprint. It is impressive that we have been able to construct these residence halls as well as a number of state-of-the-art academic buildings, such as Duques Hall, the Media and Public Affairs Building, and 1957 E Street (home to the Elliott School of International Affairs), all within our urban zone. Our strategic plan should ideally build on this long-term investment by enhancing our students’ educational experiences during the time they live on campus.

We continue to make large and important investments in academic and research facilities, particularly in the construction of Science and Engineering Hall that is now underway. When completed in early 2015, this facility will be the single largest capital investment in our history and the largest building dedicated to research and education in STEM fields in the District of Columbia.

Engagement with the Real World – GW has never been an ivory tower. Our faculty and students have always had a strong orientation towards using the knowledge and skills they hone here in action. This takes many forms that include a strong public service orientation, involvement in internships in government, international organizations and industry, and a compelling interest in translational research that moves ideas from classroom and lab to actual practice. As an institution inextricably linked to the viability of our democracy, this stance is increasingly important as we build and leverage a community that is broadly reflective of the diversity of our country and prepares our students to be citizens in a diverse and global society.

Involvement in Public Policy – Given our location, it is not surprising that our faculty and students are deeply engaged in how public policy is analyzed, formulated and implemented. This long-standing interest has resulted in GW’s faculty and alumni having substantial influence in public policy in all areas, with strength in fields such as health care policy, education, science, technology, law, intellectual property and international affairs.

International Engagement – One of the core strengths of our university is its wide range of international activities. This is most evident in the Elliott School of International Affairs, the nation’s largest such school. However, GW’s international activities extend to all our ten schools. These activities include student exchanges, degree programs that incorporate international studies, research with colleagues around the globe, service activities and institution building.

Service Orientation – GW’s faculty, staff and students have always been deeply committed to public service in all its forms. This is manifested in activities such as the Freshman Day of Service (the largest such service day of any university in terms of the number of participants), the volunteer work done by all sectors of the GW community, fund raising activities undertaken on behalf of many worthy causes, and our strong commitment to educating and serving active military personnel and veterans.

Reputation – GW has a number of programs that are highly respected around the world. Within the Law School, the intellectual property program ranked in the top three in 2011, the international law program was ranked in the top ten, and the environmental law program was included among the top twenty. Overall, the Law School is consistently ranked in the top twenty schools in the country. Columbian College’s doctoral programs now include three top twenty-five programs, as nationally ranked by the National Research Council. The Elliott School is consistently ranked one of the top programs for international relations in the country, and U.S. News and World Report ranks highly the School of Public Health and the Graduate School of Education. Coupled with the Business School’s highly regarded international business program, these rankings, as well as U.S. News and World Report’s 2011 designation of GW as a top fifty university, position us to achieve even greater institutional reputation in the years to come.

Enrollment Caps – Unlike most of our peer universities, GW is limited by agreement with the District of Columbia in the number of students and staff we can accommodate on our campuses in the District. We are subject to separate caps on our Foggy Bottom and Mount Vernon campuses. Established through our zoning plans, these limits constrain our options, requiring that any significant enrollment growth occur outside the campus boundaries. All the elements of our strategic plan must conform to the enrollment caps and other restrictions that our agreements with the District of Columbia impose upon us.

Tuition Dependence – Overall, universities depend on three revenue sources: tuition net of financial aid, externally-sponsored research, and philanthropy (either in the form of expendable gifts or endowment income). While GW has experienced some recent growth in externally-supported research and in philanthropic contributions, we still lag behind many of the universities we compete with in terms of the number and level of large gifts, endowment per student (or faculty member), the total volume of research and our net indirect cost recovery rate. As a consequence, we continue to be highly dependent on tuition income. As a result of the cap on our student enrollment imposed by the District of Columbia described above and the increasing need for financial aid (which reduces net tuition), we are unlikely to see much long-term growth in inflation-adjusted tuition income unless we choose to grow our tuition-bearing programs outside the District. Therefore, we need to focus on increasing revenue from further growth in both philanthropic contributions to the university, tuition from academic programs outside the District of Columbia and on revenues from sponsored research.

Barriers to Institutional Agility – Many of our institutional systems were designed for an era when GW was smaller than it is today and was less engaged in research than we

aspire to be. As a consequence, some of our processes and systems in areas such as research administration, information technology, faculty governance and human resource management are not as adaptable to change as we may need them be.

Major Strategic Themes of the Plan

We envision focusing GW's broad strategies over the coming decade around four major themes. As discussed above, these themes will not be the sum total of everything we do; any major university is far too complex for such a bounded strategy. However, these four themes reflect what we believe to be the intersection of GW's major strengths and opportunities. We anticipate that many of our new investments in the coming years will align with some or all of these themes. We also see innumerable opportunities for the initiatives of the ten schools of the university to align with these themes.

We recognize that our strategic themes are broad and that we will need to focus on specific areas within these themes. For each of the thematic areas, we expect we will commit to specific actions in education, research, outreach and internal practices that will best advance the university's progress towards our larger goals. These proposed actions will often reflect difficult choices and trade-offs; even within the four themes, we need to be selective in what we choose to undertake. In choosing commitments to action, we need to look to our strengths and opportunities. We also need to measure our success by how well we meet our students' needs and the needs of our larger community in the future we envision. We also will choose those actions that are consistent with our resources; our choices should be "means tested" in the sense that we should make choices where there is some degree of confidence that we either have or can generate the resources needed to implement our chosen actions. Finally, because some actions may align with more than one theme, we will favor strategic choices that reinforce our progress in several thematic areas over those that just align with one.

Each of the four strategic themes is described briefly below.

Theme 1: Globalization – GW's graduates in the coming decade will live most of their lives in a world that is much more interconnected than any previous generation has seen. While regional and national boundaries will still be important, the ability to work effectively at a global scale will be crucial to the future success of today's students. A great number of this generation's major challenges will require an understanding of diverse cultures, governmental systems, global economics, psychology and international relationships. Given GW's great strengths in many of these core competencies, we believe we should invest even more of our resources in academic, research and outreach programs that are international in nature. We should explore whether to expand the number of non-U.S. students, consider developing new partnerships in key areas of the world, and investigate new education and research programs that prepare us to be leaders in globalization.

Theme 2: Governance and Policy – Just as our current strengths around global issues make globalization a natural strategic theme, our unique location and deep engagement in many areas of governance and policy suggest that we should further build on these strengths as well. The future security and success of the U.S. depend on the policies we pursue in areas such as health care, global warming, military expenditures, human rights, international trade, taxation, income inequality, infrastructure development and R&D investments. We should leverage our partnerships with many of the local, national and international organizations that formulate and implement policies so that our students’ educational experience and our research efforts are closely linked to practice. Beyond formulating effective and fair policies, there is a need for better governance mechanisms at all levels of government. Failed states and gridlocked legislatures are unlikely to adopt any policies at all, leaving enormous social, economic and security problems unresolved. We envision expanding GW’s already substantial research and education programs in the areas of policy and governance in ways that lead to wider adoption of more effective policies at the regional, national and global scale.

Theme 3: Innovation through Interdisciplinary Collaboration – The great challenges our society faces will require new insights and innovative solutions that result from the connection and integration of many academic and professional perspectives, skills and methodologies. If GW is to be successful in contributing to addressing these challenges, we must become far more agile than we currently are in collaborating across traditional disciplinary boundaries. Our educational and research programs need to be built around a model that will often transcend the boundaries within which many of today’s faculty were trained. Students and faculty alike will need the skills to communicate ideas across disciplinary boundaries and to integrate concepts from diverse fields into creative solutions to problems. As a university, we will need to change the current incentives that often lead us to reinforce disciplinary boundaries rather than cross them. For example, we need to consider a model in which all GW undergraduates belong to a single college and choose majors from across the ten schools after the freshman or sophomore year so that they can become familiar with different areas of study. We should encourage cross-disciplinary majors and minors. We should find ways to make interdisciplinary research more agile in pushing fields forward and accelerating discovery. And we should expand the scopes of our larger research centers and institutes to bring together faculty from many disciplines, even if this means having fewer such organizations that are narrower in scope.

Theme 4: Citizenship and Leadership – George Washington envisioned a university in the nation’s capital that would educate future leaders of the new country he helped to create. As we embark on a strategic plan for the next decade, we find that Washington’s vision is as relevant today as it was during his own time. True citizenship demands committed service to our local, national and global communities. Through our academic and co-curricular programs, we need to reinforce the idea that success is measured not solely in terms of our individual economic well-being, but also in how each contributes to the larger good of the community.

The ways in which individuals and organizations relate to the communities in which they reside are critical pillars of any democratic society. Individuals are citizens of their local communities as well as of the states and nations in which they make their home; corporations, too, are citizens of the societies in which they are embedded, as are universities. It is imperative that GW think deeply about the issue of citizenship for a diverse and globally connected society on multiple levels: how we as a university relate to and serve the communities in which we live and work; how we train our students as responsible citizens and leaders; and how the research we produce translates into thoughtful leadership around the issues of individual, corporate, and university citizenship. The fundamental aim is to invest in GW's capacity to contribute to solving pressing public issues by developing and deploying the social, intellectual and civic capacity of our students, faculty, staff and alumni.

Considering the need for imaginative and effective engagement at the institutional and individual levels, GW should focus strategically on establishing and nurturing a culture both on campus and in the broader world that fosters the knowledge, skills and perspectives essential to leading and living in an increasingly diverse and global society; is attractive to all individuals regardless of their identities or backgrounds; harnesses for the common good the talents, histories, perspectives and experiences of people with differing views in the areas of teaching, research, administrative and outreach endeavors; supports reciprocal partnerships to address significant regional, national and international needs; and supports and enables the professional contributions of civic-minded faculty, staff and students both on and off campus.

Charges to Working Groups and the Timeline

What follows below are the draft charges we propose for the four thematic working groups. The steering committee asks each working group to consider its charge and give us feedback, particularly if the group's members have additional ideas aligned with their themes that they think should be explored. Once we agree with the groups on their final charges, we ask that each group deliberate on the questions in its charge and present a report addressing those questions.

Each charge reiterates the description of the theme and organizes questions to be addressed into the four areas of research, education, outreach and internal organizational structure.

We want the working groups to "think big" in the sense of considering ideas that will, if pursued, have the potential to transform aspects of the university. In considering large changes, the working groups should also identify barriers that might limit our ability to adopt those ideas. In the interest of staying focused on our longer-term strategic goals, the groups need get deeply engaged in specifying solutions to overcoming those barriers. This more detailed planning will get done in later stages of the planning process.

The working groups should engage with the entire GW community as part of their deliberations. We encourage them to meet with groups of faculty, staff, students and

alumni as they weigh the pros and cons of many of the ideas in the charges below. The groups need not come to a consensus; we expect there will be a healthy diversity of opinions that should be reflected in each group's report.

We expect the groups to think creatively about how GW can best fulfill its potential as we approach our bicentennial. We do not expect the groups to analyze in detail the costs and implementation tactics of each idea. This will be done in later stages of the planning process as the steering committee sorts through the various possible initiatives and tries to match the resources we will likely have to the potential value of the strategic options to the university.

Although each group will determine its own meeting times and schedules, as a rough guideline we expect each group to meet approximately 5-7 times for 1-2 hours each meeting. We ask that the groups' deliberations be completed by early May 2012. Sometime in the first week in May we will hold a retreat meeting of all the groups at which each group will report out to the others and we will collectively discuss all the recommendations. We will also do a mid-point check-in in early April in which the steering committee members will meet with each group separately.

A staff member will be assigned to each group to assist with note-taking and meeting logistics.

In the same spirit as the work done by the Innovation Task Force, we will provide groups with a template in the form of a Powerpoint® slide for reporting out on the charge questions. This template will ask for the group's recommendations (or the different opinions among group members on the question) and any other thoughts the group has that would inform us in making strategic choices.

Once the working groups report out and give their views on each other's recommendations, the steering committee will present its current thinking about this plan to the Board of Trustees during the June 2012 retreat. Based on the comments of the Board, the steering committee will work over the summer to integrate the best ideas into a single plan that includes estimates of resource requirements and plans regarding how to move forward. This will involve making clear choices so that the entire plan fits together as a coherent whole, is consistent with our highest priorities, and fits within our likely resources. We expect to have a draft plan by the end of August that will be reviewed with all the members of the working groups. Once the working groups report out and give their views on each other's recommendations, the steering committee will work over the summer to integrate the best ideas into a single plan that includes estimates of resource requirements and plans for how to move forward. This will involve making clear choices so that the entire plan fits together as a coherent whole, is consistent with our highest priorities, and fits within our likely resources. We expect to have a draft plan by the end of August that will be reviewed with all the members of the working groups. The revised draft will be formally presented to the community at the October Faculty Assembly meeting and to the trustees at their fall meeting.

Charge to the Working Group on Globalization

GW's graduates in the coming decade will live most of their lives in a world that is much more interconnected than any previous generation has seen. While regional and national boundaries will still be important, the ability to work effectively at a global scale will be crucial to the future success of today's students. A great number of this generation's major challenges will require an understanding of diverse cultures, governmental systems, global economics, psychology and international relationships. Given GW's great strengths in many of these core competencies, we believe we should invest even more of our resources in academic, research and outreach programs that are international in nature. We should explore whether to expand the number of non-U.S. students, consider developing new partnerships in key areas of the world, and investigate new education and research programs that prepare us to be leaders in globalization.

Charge 1. Research: Capitalizing on intellectual contributions from around the world

- What steps can be undertaken to ensure that George Washington scholars work with scholars from around the world?
- Should we be establishing partnerships with different institutions in different countries, and if so, what principles should guide us in selecting possible partners?
- How should we foster faculty-to-faculty collaborations that cross international boundaries? Should GW make a greater effort to recruit scholars from abroad?
- What are GW's current strengths in regional studies and how can we further capitalize on these?
- Are there areas of the world on which we should disproportionately focus our research efforts?

Charge 2. Education: Preparing students for a global society

- Are George Washington University undergraduates prepared to thrive in a global society? If not, how can we ensure our students are prepared?
- Can our curricular offerings be enhanced to ensure such a preparation?
- Should we expand study abroad opportunities? What format should our study abroad take to ensure an in-depth and meaningful engagement of our students in foreign countries?
- Are there other things that should be done to ensure our students are prepared for a world where the importance of national boundaries is diminished and where careers often require understanding of other languages, cultures and history?
- What steps should be taken to offer a George Washington University education to students from different countries?

- Should our effort to reach out to students from around the world be done through individual recruitment, institution-to-institution partnerships, or both?
- Should we make an extra effort to educate students from particular countries? If so, which countries?
- What are the unique challenges associated with recruitment of international students and how can these be overcome?
- On the graduate level, what programs are particularly attractive to international students and how can we capitalize on this?
- What should be done to ensure that international students are comfortable in and enrich the campus culture?

Charge 3. Outreach: Improving understanding around the world

- How should we ensure that the research being done at George Washington is disseminated around the world?
- How can GW use the tools of advanced learning, such as seminars, distance or onsite learning collaboratives, colloquia, and other techniques, to reach established and emerging leaders in the global arena, especially in regions where GW decides to strategically focus?
- Should there be a core requirement for graduate and post-graduate programs to train students on the importance of dissemination of their research and disciplines in and beyond the U.S.?
- How should GW use existing publications, websites, and new social media technologies to communicate globally?

Charge 4. Institutional Structure: Ensuring support for a globally-focused university

- As George Washington becomes more of an international university, are our central resources (student health, International Services Office; language preparation) up to this task?
- Likewise, is the university's development office adequately prepared to capitalize on opportunities for fundraising to generate resources needed to fund a more global strategy?
- What if anything needs to be done to ensure coordination across our international efforts?

Charge to Working Group on Governance and Policy

Just as our current strengths around global issues make globalization a natural strategic theme, our unique location and deep engagement in many areas of governance and policy suggest that we should further build on these strengths as well. The future security and success of the U.S. depend on the policies we pursue in areas such as health care, global warming, military expenditures, human rights, international trade, taxation, income inequality, infrastructure development and R&D investments. We should leverage our partnerships with many of the local, national and international organizations that formulate and implement policies so that our students' educational experience and our research efforts are closely linked to practice. Beyond formulating effective and fair policies, there is a need for better governance mechanisms at all levels of government. Failed states and gridlocked legislatures are unlikely to adopt any policies at all, leaving enormous social, economic and security problems unresolved. We envision expanding GW's already substantial research and education programs in the areas of policy and governance in ways that lead to wider adoption of more effective policies at the regional, national and global scale.

Charge 1. Research: Translating policy and policy relevance into scientific research and inquiry

- What steps might GW take to both stimulate and reward innovation to develop research strategies that embed policy questions into scientific inquiry?
- What actions by GW might encourage research collaboration and partnerships between faculty whose expertise lies in policy content and policy analysis and faculty whose expertise lies in scientific inquiry and the application of scientific research methods to broad problems of policy?
- How can GW develop an approach to research that emphasizes not only the creation of evidence but its translation into policy-relevant knowledge?
- What sources of extramural funding should be encouraged because of their connection with policy-relevant research?
- How can policy-relevant research and scholarship best be rewarded as a key aspect of faculty career development and advancement?
- How can faculty be supported in the development of policy-relevant research proposals and the transformation of the results of research into policy formulation and scholarship?
- Should GW establish a policy-oriented think tank? If so, how should it go about doing this?

Charge 2. Education: Building a policy-relevant educational experience

- How can GW educate its students to engage in critical thinking about the policy implications of key developments?
- How can faculty better train students to move beyond the specific disciplinary and technical issues that tend to dominate training in any field and begin to discern broader policy questions and patterns?
- How can faculty best train students in policy analysis, particularly in the methods that underlie problem identification and policy solution development, testing and evaluation?
- How can faculty train students in meaningful and effective policy advocacy across the range of stakeholder interests?
- What educational immersion experiences, such as policymaking internships both inside and outside government, might be systematically built into training in policy thinking?
- What are the most important partnering public and private institutions for purposes of policy education and training?
- How can students best be exposed to the differences and similarities in policy decision-making at the community, state, national and global levels of collective action?

Charge 3. Outreach: Advancing new models of public, private, and corporate governance

- How can GW best become a center for advanced training and education in policymaking in both the public and private sectors?
- How can GW use the tools of advanced learning, such as seminars, distance learning, onsite learning collaboratives, colloquia, and other techniques, to reach established and emerging policy leaders in both public and private policymaking roles?
- Across fields and disciplines, how can faculty be encouraged to collaborate with public, private and corporate stakeholders to examine and write about the range of approaches to governance and their impact?

Charge 4. Institutional Change: Strengthening GW's position as a center of deliberation and discourse on matters of policy

- Should GW consider the creation of a center for formal policy collaboration among scholars drawn from competing fields and disciplines?
- What strategies can GW pursue to enhance and deepen our reputation as a center of thoughtful and nonpartisan policy development and thought?
- Should advanced leadership training in policy, policymaking, and governance become a formal aspect of GW's educational programming at both the undergraduate and graduate levels?

Charge to the Working Group on Innovation through Interdisciplinary Collaboration

The great challenges our society faces will require new insights and innovative solutions that result from the connection and integration of many academic and professional perspectives, skills and methodologies. If GW is to be successful in contributing to addressing these challenges, we must become far more agile than we currently are in collaborating across traditional disciplinary boundaries. Our educational and research programs need to be built around a model that will often transcend the boundaries within which many of today's faculty were trained. Students and faculty alike will need the skills to communicate ideas across disciplinary boundaries and to integrate concepts from diverse fields into creative solutions to problems. As a university, we will need to change the current incentives that often lead us to reinforce disciplinary boundaries rather than cross them. For example, we need to consider a model in which all GW undergraduates belong to a single college and choose majors from across the ten schools after the freshman or sophomore year so that they can become familiar with different areas of study. We should encourage cross-disciplinary majors and minors. We should find ways to make interdisciplinary research more agile in pushing fields forward and accelerating discovery. And we should expand the scopes of our larger research centers and institutes to bring together faculty from many disciplines, even if this means having fewer such organizations that are narrower in scope.

Charge 1. Research: Promoting interdisciplinary collaboration

- How can GW expand externally sponsored research in areas such as biomedical research by taking better advantage of our ability to work across disciplinary and school boundaries? What interdisciplinary areas of strength do we have that include significant elements from the medical sciences and how can we strengthen them?
- What steps can GW take to encourage scholars to undertake strategic research that addresses fundamental issues or problems that cross disciplinary boundaries?
- How can GW encourage and support faculty collaboration on interdisciplinary research?
- What are GW's current interdisciplinary research strengths and how can we strengthen them further?
- Are there particular areas of potential research synergies between the medical, nursing, and health sciences and other schools such as law, engineering, business, and other areas of research? How can GW better catalyze these synergies?
- What, if any, additional interdisciplinary research centers should GW establish? Should GW eliminate or combine centers that are currently dominated by single disciplines?

- How can GW become more agile in fostering interdisciplinary research to respond to new challenges as they arise in the future? Should GW utilize “pop-up” research centers to encourage interdisciplinary collaboration for a specific research question and that have a limited life span?

Charge 2. Education: Preparing students for an interdisciplinary world

- How can GW facilitate interdisciplinary learning experiences in the university and residential college environments?
- How can GW best expose students to new areas of intellectual experience and a range of disciplinary perspectives that cross schools and modes of thinking?
- Should students be exposed to interdisciplinary learning experiences at the start of their education? If so, how?
- Should there be a common undergraduate core curriculum? What constitutes a major? What parameters should be set for interdisciplinary courses of study and for students to be able to develop their own combination of majors/fields of study?
- How, and to what extent, should GW develop and promote interdisciplinary graduate programs? Should it be a fundamental expectation that graduate programs be interdisciplinary?
- Should GW consider new interdisciplinary degrees?
- Should GW expand and redesign its five-year, dual-degree programs to increase student familiarity with different disciplines?

Charge 3. Outreach: Promoting an interdisciplinary culture

- How should we ensure that the research being done at GW is disseminated to the broader public in D.C., the U.S., and the world?
- Should there be a core requirement that graduate programs train students in the public understanding of their research and disciplines?
- How can GW foster a responsibility to engage the public with discoveries and intellectual dialogues taking place at GW?
- How should GW use existing publications, our website and new media technologies to communicate interdisciplinary research ideas?

Charge 4. Institutional Structure: Enabling interdisciplinary collaborations

- How can GW move from a discipline-based structure to one that encourages and supports interdisciplinary work?
- How can physical space enhance interdisciplinary faculty research (e.g., placement of departments, shared research space, space for interdisciplinary discussions)?
- What impact would this have on the current organization of departments, hiring and promotion practices, budgeting, faculty governance and curriculum?

- Should the provost employ an interdisciplinary faculty tenure and promotion committee as an advisory body?
- Should cross-disciplinary faculty appointments be encouraged? Should multiple appointments be focused on an interdisciplinary research area? If so, what steps can be taken to encourage this?
- Should all undergraduates be enrolled in a single “college” and taught by faculty associated with schools/colleges that have graduate programs?
- What, if any, pedagogical shifts should GW encourage faculty to make in their teaching that support interdisciplinary learning (e.g., problem- or theme-based learning, team teaching)?
- Are there steps GW needs to take to ensure that our educational support services (e.g., library system) are able to provide information for students and scholars who need to cross-disciplinary lines?

Charge to the Working Group on Citizenship and Leadership

George Washington envisioned a university in the nation's capital that would educate future leaders of the new country he helped to create. As we embark on a strategic plan for the next decade, we find that Washington's vision is as relevant today as it was during his own time. True citizenship demands committed service to our local, national and global communities. Through our academic and co-curricular programs, we need to reinforce the idea that success is measured not solely in terms of our individual economic well-being, but also in how each contributes to the larger good of the community.

The ways in which individuals and organizations relate to the communities in which they reside are critical pillars of any democratic society. Individuals are citizens of their local communities as well as of the states and nations in which they make their home; corporations, too, are citizens of the societies in which they are embedded, as are universities. It is imperative that GW think deeply about the issue of citizenship for a diverse and globally connected society on multiple levels: how we as a university relate to and serve the communities in which we live and work; how we train our students as responsible citizens and leaders; and how the research we produce translates into thoughtful leadership around the issues of individual, corporate, and university citizenship. The fundamental aim is to invest in GW's capacity to contribute to solving pressing public issues by developing and deploying the social, intellectual and civic capacity of our students, faculty, staff and alumni.

Considering the need for imaginative and effective engagement at the institutional and individual levels, GW should focus strategically on establishing and nurturing a culture both on campus and in the broader world that fosters the knowledge, skills and perspectives essential to leading and living in an increasingly diverse and global society; is attractive to all individuals regardless of their identities or backgrounds; harnesses for the common good the talents, histories, perspectives and experiences of people with differing views in the areas of teaching, research, administrative and outreach endeavors; supports reciprocal partnerships to address significant regional, national and international needs; and supports and enables the professional contributions of civic-minded faculty, staff and students both on and off campus.

Charge 1. Research: Expanding research on citizenship and leadership

Research on citizenship has heretofore been a somewhat narrowly defined field of inquiry. Mostly tied to research and thinking on political systems or to more theoretical work on the public sphere and the meaning of democracy, research questions have stayed close to home in a few social science disciplines. Yet, citizenship is a broad and important topic with implications that touch many fields, many disciplines, and many social issues. There is a robust body of literature on organizational citizenship and justice within the workplace, and this work is an important part of how we think about citizenship broadly. Similarly, the body of research that has emerged around the issue of

corporate social responsibility deals directly with the issue of the citizenship requirements of corporations in society. Important as this work is within business schools, the field has been relegated to the margins as the normative issues that have dominated debates over corporate social responsibility over the last several decades and is not generally thought of in citizenship terms. The same could be said for the growing body of interdisciplinary work on the issue of sustainability as it also fits under a broadly defined rubric of citizenship. The key point here is that citizenship is a broad and crucial concept for individuals and organizations in the 21st century, especially those that are thinking about responsibilities of service. At GW, we already have a significant amount of work going on in these areas, and we need to think about how to bring these strands together as part of our core brand. Questions to be addressed in this charge might include:

- How can GW best contribute to understanding and shaping the ideals of citizenship and engagement in a local, national, and global context?
- How can we link advances in science and other fields in order to bring maximum benefit to the broadest number of people and places?
- What innovations can be brought to bear on the creation and exchange of knowledge and information in order to improve the conditions that confront local, national and global communities?
- What investments should we make in research and scholarship in order to generate the type of knowledge that brings value to the world we live in?

Charge 2. Education: Fostering citizenship and leaderships skills

George Washington's original vision for a university in the nation's capital was that it would educate future leaders of the new country he helped create. He recognized that a free society ultimately depends on its citizens and that the way to infuse the public with the necessary qualities is through education. We aspire with this topic area to push the university to think about how we train our students as citizens of their communities and citizens of the world. Citizenship has become an important area of intellectual inquiry and we should ensure our curricular aims are not merely to funnel academically prepared students into specialized careers, although there is increasing external pressure to do so. Teaching students to be higher order citizens is one of the greatest services we can provide as a university and also links to our focus on governance and policy. Questions to be addressed in this charge might include:

- How do we redesign the educational experience in order to foster the skills and values on which positive contributions are built both locally and nationally as well as globally?
- What educational experiences and outcomes will best enable students to become campus citizens and social leaders?
- How might the university advance the concepts of community and citizenship through the residential experience?
- What investments in human capital within the university community – in its educational endeavors and human resources – will be vital to our success?
- How can the university use the concept of citizenship to move away from siloed learning and isolated departments and units?

- What educational and supportive innovations might help us gain strength from the diversity of our students, faculty, staff and alumni?
- How can we create international learning communities for students and staff in support of global and local citizenship in a world defined in terms of cross-cultural encounters?

Charge 3. Outreach: Responsibilities of citizenship and leadership

This is an issue that extends across research and education, asking how research might best inform the responsibilities that come with advanced citizenship; and also how students and the university might be best prepared to deliver on the challenge of being exemplary citizens and servants of our local community and of the world. It also extends to the university as a whole and its citizenship responsibilities to our local community and to the world at large. Questions to be addressed in this charge might include:

- How can GW more effectively contribute as a “citizen” of the District of Columbia?
- What relationships should the university forge between the community and our faculty, students and staff?
- On which communities should we focus?
 - The university community?
 - The D.C. metropolitan region?
 - The community of policymakers involved in the local, regional, national and global scenes?
- How should our status as a tax-exempt institution guide our thinking in this regard, and what types of “community benefits” should we emphasize?
- Should we focus on improving educational, health, economic and business, artistic, cultural, and social opportunities for D.C. as other educational institutions have done?
- How can GW best reward service to, and engagement with, the broader D.C. community?

Charge 4. Institutional Structure: Enabling citizenship and leadership

Such high-minded goals ranging from research to education on citizenship cannot be achieved without the right university infrastructure to enable these goals. We must, therefore, strive to create the appropriate infrastructure to best achieve these ends. We need to build a community within the university that demonstrates the values of inclusion, integrity, service and excellence that should be the hallmark of citizenship. Our faculty and staff must have opportunities to model constructive engagement as citizens and leaders through what they teach and what they do. Questions to be addressed in this charge might include:

- What university investments in resources and human capital will make our engagement possible?
- What policies and practices related to learning at both the undergraduate and graduate levels merit fresh thinking and investments?

- How do we promote engagement by under-represented university communities such as graduate students, working parents, and others?
- How can we address the space and resource constraints that impede collaboration and cross-interest learning?
- What barriers frustrate recruitment and retention of a highly engaged student body and workforce, and how do we remove those barriers?
- Should GW radically restructure the undergraduate residential experience such that students have increased opportunities to practice self-governance and citizenship? Among the possible ideas to consider is the creation of residential colleges for undergraduate students where they reside for all four years and work to create a stronger sense of community and shared governance.