

·Senior Leadership Team Meeting
Staff Edition
May 6, 2020

1. Approve minutes from last meeting
2. University leadership updates (Geneva)
 - a. ULC
 - i. Contingency planning
 1. Scenario 1: ~\$100M savings target — normal fall start with social distancing, few enrollment disruptions other than international students.
 2. Scenario 2: ~\$200M savings target — start online, delayed on-campus activity until mid-year, potential mid-year disruption, with social distancing.
 3. Scenario 3: ~\$300M savings target — all online.
 4. Given faculty employment status and other considerations, staff compensation will likely need to be targeted for cuts.
 - ii. While enrollment numbers are down, they could be worse.
 - b. Provost's Senior Staff
 - i. We are about 19% behind on enrollments at the moment. Originally targeted 2250 students; Ed projecting ~2000-2100 with melt rate.
 1. Going back to waitlist, aiming for 300 transfer students.
 2. Above target revenue for enrollments — likely means a less diverse and less high-need class.
 - c. Council of Deans
 - i. Student visa issuance deadlines have been pushed back and student visas have been prioritized over tourist visas.
 - d. Update on communication
 - i. LAI model shares as much information as possible when possible.
 - ii. Faculty, students are not aware of work being done by GW administration—especially in comparison to other universities' comms.
 - e. Questions/comments?
 - i. How has the expected melt model been adjusted for this scenario?
 1. Working off of past melt rates (on normal and conservative bases). Conservative model comes from 2009 post-recession enrollment, but that analogy is not a perfect fit. Currently have ~2300 deposits, Ed projects ~2000-2100 students with conservative melt rate.
 - ii. Anything about returning students?
 1. Available indications are that most students plan to return. GW intends to make a call by June 15, but if we go in-person and then DC issues a closure order thereafter and we have to go online—students have asked about deferring, reduced tuition, etc.
3. Concierge-style faculty outreach

a. Updates

- i. Cleaned up the list of summer courses, removing those that were originally to be taught online as well as courses from the SoN, SMHS, Summer Scholars, and Summer Academy. From there, we have several options (do we exclude Law, Milken, etc?), but we end up with approximately 379 instructors for the summer without further exclusion.
- ii. Drafted a sample email that the "concierges" can send out to their faculty, either as-is or modified to fit their own style.
- iii. Next step would be to identify who is acting in the "conciierge" roles and assign/let them pick their instructors to get started. If we limit this to only liaison librarians, they will have approximately 27 each. Suggest this circle should be widened to include as many staff as possible, thereby reducing the number of faculty assigned to each person.

b. Outstanding questions (Robin)

- i. Do we want to track this centrally to see how much we hear from faculty based on this? If so, it would be helpful to start with a procedure instead of asking people to add that in after it has started.
- ii. Do we want Geneva to introduce this to the deans first?
 1. Holding calls with deans and raising question of conciierge approach; deans have been receptive and supportive so far.
- iii. Do we want any kind of special training for the "concierges" or can I just write up a list of instructions?
 1. I don't believe that we need special skilling for concierges this summer as long as the role is primarily to connect teachers with resources and not solve technical problems, do complex tasks, etc.
 2. +1 to conciierge approach -- this vocabulary is meaningful for LAI employees, the summer is a good time to test and learn, and there is data to suggest that faculty will feed more general questions about how to teach successfully online to LAI liaisons. Data points from cluster pilot attached to department seem to support.
 3. +1 to cluster of librarians to department.
- iv. Are we assigning folks to departments or individually to faculty?
 1. Had been thinking of a liaison team assigned to a particular department, and that team does reach out individually to faculty within that department.
 2. Teaming aspect might require more coordination. If we added the IC and AT staff to the pool and get the ratio down, I think we could operate successfully over the summer.
- v. What is the date we would need to communicate this program to be useful?

1. Summer 1 starts May 18, but the program could be rolled out at any point -- starting a couple weeks into Summer 1 might even be more beneficial for faculty.
- vi. Could we do a small pilot of this program with certain faculty, then phase more in until we have a fully functional program by Fall 2020?
1. Need to balance making the greatest impact for the greatest number of people in the campus community against being able to roll out a high-quality program that reflects well upon LAI and does things right.
 2. We could aim a pilot at departments with which we have a good relationship and are big on summer courses.
- c. Geneva: This is the time to start thinking about how forming these liaison teams might work, as well as the departments in which these teams would have a significant impact (even departments we work closely with have faculty across the spectrum).