



Faculty Senate

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SENATE MEETING HELD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2020 VIA WEBEX

Present: President LeBlanc; Provost Blake; Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair Wilson; Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Registrar Amundson; Senate Staffers Liz Carlson and Jenna Chaojareon; Deans Bass, Feuer, Goldman, Henry, Jeffries, Lach, and Mehrotra; Interim Dean Feldman; Acting Dean Feuer; Professors Abramowicz, Agnew, Baird, Borum, Cohen-Cole, Cordes, Costello, Galston, Garris, Griesshammer, Gupta, Gutman, Johnson, Khilji, Kurtzman, Lewis, Marotta-Walters, McHugh, Moersen, Mylonas, Orti, Parsons, Perry, Prasad, Rain, Roddis, Sarkar, Schumann, Subiaul, Swaine, Tekleselassie, Tielsch, Wagner, Wirtz, Yezer, and Zara.

Absent: Deans Matthew and Wahlbeck; Professors Eleftherianos, Rao, and Vonortas.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:03p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the August 14, 2020, Faculty Senate meeting were approved unanimously without comment.

INTRODUCTIONS

President LeBlanc welcomed Professor Michael Abramowicz to the Senate. Professor Abramowicz was recently elected to the Senate to complete the term begun by Professor Sonia Suter.

The President, in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), proposed that the order of the agenda be changed to begin with the President's update on operational, academic, and financial planning. Without objection, the agenda proceeded with this update.

UPDATE: Operational/Academic/Financial Planning Updates (Thomas LeBlanc, President, and Brian Blake, Provost)

President LeBlanc welcomed the Senate to its first meeting of the new academic year. GW's busy summer has led straight into a busy fall semester. All of the faculty continue to dedicate a lot of extra time and energy to teaching courses online and making sure GW's students still have a high-quality academic experience—and he again thanked the Senate and all of their colleagues for all their hard work. Juggling competing demands on limited time and managing the present challenges is not easy, and he noted his great appreciation for the faculty's commitment to the university.

The university has been featuring some of the faculty's work through the "GW All Access" series of stories in GW Today, and the President noted he has enjoyed seeing these well-deserved features, and getting the chance to check in with the faculty personally and learn more about them. He also enjoyed the opportunity recently to welcome GW's new faculty, and faculty who are new to leadership positions, at a virtual orientation session. He also attended the first Multicultural Student Services Center (MSSC) block party online; he noted that, while a block party feels very different online, it was a wonderful to bring a large group of students together.

GW's campus operations are going smoothly, and the university continues to enforce health and safety measures for all those approved to be on campus, including regular testing. Testing is among the university's most important protocols, and it is running well thanks in large part to GW's faculty. The President in particular recognized the leadership of the Milken Institute School of Public Health (GWSPH) Dean Lynn Goldman and Professor Cindy Liu in this effort. With the leadership of GW's expert public health, medical, and nursing communities, the university continues to perform its in-house FDA-approved testing and is closely monitoring the results and responding appropriately. The President noted that he has already been tested twice under this protocol, and results are returned within 24 hours. Compliance with GW's public health requirements is high, and this is expected to continue through the semester.

The President noted that he and other members of the administration continue to spend a lot of time in conversation with the Senate and others to mitigate the university's budget challenges. He reiterated that, with the decision to go online for the fall semester, the university had been anticipating a budget impact of over \$200 million on an annualized basis; the decision to be online in itself removes around \$100 million from the university's budget. Given the fluid nature of the pandemic and its effects on the university, as expected, this estimate has continued to evolve, and the administration now has a better idea of our fall enrollment and tuition revenue. Based on this latest data, the university is currently estimating a \$180 million budget impact on an annualized basis; this figure assumes that GW will remain online through the whole fiscal year. No decisions have been made yet about the spring semester, so this number may well change. An in-residence spring semester could improve the gap significantly.

At the moment, however, the university is planning under the assumption that spring will also be a virtual term. Approximately \$76 million of the lost revenue is associated with tuition. Graduate tuition is about \$17 million below the original target, and undergraduate tuition is about \$46 million below the original target. Financial aid is about \$10 million over the original target. The Provost will provide more enrollment details in his update. The President stated that undergraduate enrollment is

about 1000 students below the university's target of 10,126.¹ Over 600 of these students are upper class students who did not return this fall; 175 international students were either not able to or chose not to enroll. Despite the university's aggressive use of the waitlist, 220 fewer domestic undergraduate students were enrolled as new students this fall.

The first phase of mitigation steps has included restructuring, a salary freeze, a hiring freeze, leadership salary reductions, significant reductions in non-compensation budgets, and difficult decisions regarding staff layoffs. This phase of response is now nearing completion, and all actions from this phase are expected to be fully implemented within the next week or two. During this phase, the university has also offset some of the negative budget impact by using reserves for one-time health and safety expenses, including the university's in-house testing facility.

Collectively, actions during this first phase have mitigated roughly \$100 million, so even with a less unfavorable budget impact of \$180 million, it is clear that additional mitigation actions will need to be taken. In the second phase of mitigation, the university recently announced the temporary suspension of retirement contributions, which takes effect in October; this will reduce expenses by \$27 million for the remainder of the fiscal year. Beyond this step, the administration has not made any additional decisions at this time and wants to continue discussions with the full Senate, its leadership, and the Board to identify options to identify any remaining mitigation steps necessary. Final decisions are expected to be reached within the next week or two, at which point the administration will have completed its fiscal year mitigation. As indicated earlier, circumstances may improve if the spring term can be held in residence. The President stated that he doesn't see these fiscal assumptions getting much worse than they are now due to the conservative nature of the assumptions made; however, the pandemic continues to bring a great deal of uncertainty to this work.

The President noted that he understands the concerns he has heard from faculty. He stated that he is listening closely to all feedback, and it will continue to inform planning and any decisions made. He added that the university will also always prioritize health and safety and the core academic mission.

President LeBlanc noted that he continues to be grateful to the Senate and their colleagues for their contributions to GW and their active participation in the ongoing discussions about GW's challenges and future. He recognized that the sheer number of Senators means that the cumulative hours spent by the Senate exceed those spent by the members of the administration; he estimated that he, the Provost, and the CFO have spent over 200 hours with the Senate and its committees during the course of the pandemic thus far. He expressed his strong belief that the constructive conversations and the robust discussions held as a community serve to make GW stronger. Even when there is disagreement, he noted, the administration is always listening. He recognized that the administration needs to do more to continue to foster a dialogue and enhance its communications with the faculty, and he committed to working hard this fall to do so.

Finally, he briefly mentioned some upcoming events he hoped would be on faculty calendars:

¹ The administration clarified this comment following the meeting, noting that "Preliminary undergraduate enrollment is about 1000 students below the university's target of 10,126 for full-time equivalent Foggy Bottom students."

- Three town halls hosted by the [Special Committee on the Marvin Center Name](#) will be held this month on September 15, 17, and 22. The President invited the faculty to attend and provide their feedback to the special committee leading this important process. As previously announced, the Board of Trustees issued and endorsed a report outlining a process for considering name change requests at GW. The first two petitions for name changes that have gone through this process are the Marvin Center name and the Colonials moniker. The committees established as a result of the process are chaired by Law School professors and have begun their work. The entire GW community should shortly receive information about these town halls by email; similar opportunities for engagement will be forthcoming for the [Special Committee on the Colonials Moniker](#).
- Only-at-GW events are also continuing virtually this fall:
 - On September 15, GW's [Race in America Lecture Series](#) continues with a moderated discussion with Nikole Hannah-Jones, an award-winning investigative reporter covering racial injustice for The New York Times Magazine, a MacArthur genius grant fellow, and the creator of the landmark 1619 Project on slavery.
 - To kick off the Presidential Distinguished Event Series, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer will participate in a [discussion](#) moderated by GW Law leadership on Constitution Day, September 17.

The President made mention of Resolution 21/12, which will be read into the record during this meeting in appreciation of Professor Sylvia Marotta-Walters. He reiterated his comments from the spring, when the traditional offering of this resolution was delayed due to the immediacy of the pandemic, noting that Professor Marotta-Walters served the Senate with extraordinary wisdom and distinction. He added that he is pleased the Senate will recognize her service formally today with this resolution.

The President also recognized that today is 9/11. A virtual event is ongoing at GW today in recognition of this anniversary. He noted that 9/11 was a horrible event that will never be forgotten, and he expressed his gratitude for today's virtual event of remembrance, which also honors the GW alumni who lost their lives that day.

Provost Blake thanked the classroom technology, instructional core, and information technology staff for all they have done to prepare GW for a virtual fall term. He noted that he has received very positive feedback from faculty and students so far regarding the start of GW's virtual fall semester; a great deal of the credit for this goes to the faculty, who worked very hard over the summer to prepare for this teaching environment. He noted that several faculty have commented to him that the fully-virtual experience has proved rewarding in many ways as it encourages them to continuously enhance their teaching methods and that some faculty have indicated they would like to retain a virtual aspect to their courses even when resident education resumes. He noted that the keywords of the term are adaptability and flexibility. He added that the higher education landscape will be different post-COVID-19, and the university will have to think about this will mean for GW.

He noted that undergraduate registrations are down about 7.2% overall and that graduate registrations are up about 1.3%. Non-degree registrations, a much smaller population, are down 31%. Placing this in context, the Provost noted that the university would typically expect a 3% increase in tuition revenue year over year; holding tuition rates steady at the graduate level translates

to flat revenue despite higher enrollments. He emphasized the large impact in GW's international student population, which is down 916 students overall (undergraduate 253, graduate 556, and non-degree 107). This is cause for concern, as this year's shortfalls in international enrollments are likely to follow the university in this population over the next few years. Additionally, lower enrollments in this population has an impact on GW's cultural diversity. Approximately 400 more students than usual have elected to defer enrollment until next year or to take a leave of absence, and hundreds more students are attending part-time.

The Provost noted the importance of having an open conversation this fall about the composition of next year's entering class. He reported that he held a very preliminary meeting earlier this week to start teasing out the major topics that will need to be considered over the next several weeks around decision-making timelines for spring, culminating in decisions around mid-October. At least initially, he indicated that the university must consider the likelihood that GW be in a virtual format again for the spring term. Then, consideration needs to be given to what a partial population of campus might look like. He noted that it feels unlikely, at present, that GW will be 100% in person in spring 2021. There are different opportunities for phased or rotated-presence openings, and these challenges should inform how the university thinks about instruction into the future, perhaps considering incorporating a hybrid or "HyFlex" model going forward. The Provost provided an example based on how the university thought during the summer about how to adjust campus facilities to accommodate the full class. He considered an alternative approach that would track enrollments by virtual or in-person designations and have individuals come to classes based on the stated capacity of the classroom/facility, which would be preset to allow for social distancing. This could be set for the term or adjusted when needed throughout the term; the latter would be more challenging but would provide a lot of flexibility as required. The Provost expressed his hope that he might discuss with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) how best to hold a community conversation on this heading into the spring term.

Professor Cohen-Cole asked about stated university priorities around enhancing the student experience. Specifically, he asked how layoffs of advising and career counseling staff are prioritized against other expenses—for example, what is the relative cost of the salaries cut in these student-facing areas versus the cost of the recent search for the Vice President of Marketing position that resulted in the Heather Swain hire.

Provost Blake responded that layoff considerations were intended first to ensure that staffing was as efficient as possible across campus before other, cross-cutting measures were taken (e.g., retirement contribution suspensions) or before taking actions that might impact the long-term sustainability of the institution (e.g., endowment draws). He noted that, in the advising and career services areas, a serious effort was undertaken to ensure that these were efficiently and correctly staffed. He confirmed that the review of these areas included a review of national norms, anecdotal challenges specific to GW, and quantitative analyses. From the advising standpoint, the national average indicates 250 students per advisor; the review of this area considered where advisors were placed at GW and indicated that GW's advising load was about 193 students per advisor. A reorganization led to some position eliminations as workloads were rebalanced to achieve a workload of 220 students per advisor. He noted that his office did not weigh in on which areas seemed over-invested but rather left these reorganization decisions to the deans. He added that career services position eliminations were primarily at the management level. Here, too, the review looked at national staffing information around numbers and types of advisors and found that GW's coverage in this area was pretty close to the national norms but that about a third of the current staff were managers

or directors. He affirmed that these were difficult decisions and that, as reorganizations were implemented, employees whose positions were being eliminated were given the opportunity to look at other open positions at GW.

President LeBlanc added that the average salary of laid-off individuals to date is about \$75K. Typically, he added, an executive search would cost approximately \$100K, but, in case of the recent Vice President for Marketing search, the university ultimately did not spend any money. Professor Cohen-Cole requested clarification on this last point, and the President responded that the university reached an agreement that it would not spend any money on this search.

Professor Griesshammer offered several comments and questions. He noted that the greater diversity of the incoming class is very likely due to the socioeconomic fact that wealthier students can afford to delay attending GW as they are self-financed, while poorer students—typically the more diverse population—don't have the same luxury of waiting a year. He added that the HyFlex model is interesting, but cautioned that this is an area in which the administration can participate in a shared governance discussion but not make a final decision; this decision belongs solidly in the faculty realm. His last comment noted that he did not receive responses to his questions from the last Senate meeting, although the minutes show they were promised to be provided by email².

He asked the following questions³:

1. How many staff members have been laid off since March 2020?
2. Given that law is one of GW's strongest areas, what signal does it send if the university lays off the only pre-law advisor at GW?
3. The stated \$180 million budget gap is what would be incurred if GW remains in the virtual realm all year; are current mitigation strategies working toward this full target, or is there a plan to delay some decisions until more information is available about the spring semester?
4. Where do discussions stand about the limited role of increased endowment payouts to help mitigate budget shortfalls?
5. When will faculty and administration see evidence that suggests the restructuring of the Academic Technologies/Information Technology and research administrative support service areas actually addressed existing problems or issues in a meaningful way supported by data?

President LeBlanc responded that there have been about 250 layoffs to date and that ongoing discussions are taking place around the use of GW assets as a possible mitigating measure (he noted that members of the FSEC and the Board of Trustees have also met to discuss this issue as well as others). He confirmed that, in December, the university will begin to look at any mitigation steps taken to assess whether they need to be continued (e.g., the suspension of retirement contributions) to address a budget shortfall.

Provost Blake indicated he would provide Professor Griesshammer with a formal response to his questions. He noted that diversity in the student body is considered on a number of measures, from ethnicity to program of study to geography, among others. He noted that socioeconomic position is

² Provost Blake provided responses to these questions by email on September 25; these responses have been appended to these minutes.

³ Provost Blake provided responses to these questions by email on October 5; these responses have been appended to these minutes in the same document referenced in footnote 2.

absolutely a piece of what leads a student to matriculate or delay and noted that, including the process of admitting from the waitlist, the university was very careful to build as diverse a class as possible. He suggested that the Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (CCAS) dean might have more specific information about the pre-law advisor position, as this was a CCAS position. With regard to Professor Griesshammer's last question, the Provost noted that these reorganizations were the combination of efforts for increased efficiency as well as budget mitigation. He expressed his hope that, moving forward, the shared services groups will continue to be engaged and extremely active in order to provide feedback on how well the reorganizations are working.

Professor Orti noted that he is happy to hear GW's testing protocol is going well. He had heard there is a dashboard coming for GW COVID-19 data, and he asked what GW's positive-test numbers are thus far. He also asked whether, even under a virtual spring semester, there might be the possibility of bringing more students to campus in spring 2021. President LeBlanc confirmed that a dashboard is coming—he previewed a sample today and hopes to see it posted for the GW community as soon as Monday. He noted that, in the time period from August 3 through September 9, the university administered 5637 tests; of this number, nine were positive (a 0.02% positivity rate). He noted that the dashboard will let the user look at the data at the full university level or by a single campus or population element as well as by date range. He added that GW's testing has a very low false positive rate compared to other tests currently available on the market. He welcomed feedback on the dashboard once it has been posted. He noted that the public health experts advising the process have indicated that the rolling 7-day average is the right statistic to consider, but the dashboard will allow a range of views.

In response to Professor Orti's second question, Provost Blake responded that, for fall, initial plans imagined that approximately 2000 students could be in residence. Plans for spring residence will be constrained by requirements in the District around public health and safety. He expressed his particular sympathy for first-year students (and their need to engage with the campus) as well as seniors (and their plans for graduation). President LeBlanc noted that there are three options for spring residence:

1. Current fall plans, which protect the most vulnerable populations and house those needing access to specific facilities for their programs of study (approximately 500 students);
2. Expanded housing, which would allow students in residence up to a housing limit where everyone essentially has a single occupancy space (approximately 2500 students)—this would need to be assessed under the university's and the District's safety restrictions; and
3. Full student residence (approximately 6500 students), which would only be workable if national and local pandemic circumstances permit.

The President added that the District has remained in Phase 2 and that the university will continue to work with District authorities when planning for the spring semester.

Professor Marotta-Walters asked whether, now that the university is reaching the close of its original budget mitigation plans, a next wave should be expected in the near term. She noted that the *Faculty Code* delineates specific circumstances under which tenured faculty can be furloughed or laid off and that there is a waiting period before such measures can be implemented. She asked whether there have been any conversations (either to date or planned) around laying off tenured faculty due to financial exigencies and what the process would be if this needed to happen. President LeBlanc responded that, in all the mitigation scenarios discussed (which have been shared with the Senate), none has included laying off tenured or tenure-track faculty. The possibility of salary reductions has been discussed, but no decisions have been made. Thus far, the only decision in this area is the

decision to temporarily suspend retirement plan contributions. He affirmed the administration's efforts to protect the core academic mission in every action taken, noting that this is evidenced in part by the fact that the university has not taken these types of actions and does not plan to do so.

Professor Perry noted that Senators receive a lot of feedback from their faculty colleagues as well as questions to bring forward. In that spirit, she offered two questions from the GWSPH faculty:

1. Can data about the nature of laid-off staff—in terms of demographics such as gender, age, ethnicity, seniority status, etc.—be made available? She noted that it is important to understand how these layoffs impact the university's identity and inform future mitigation strategies that might be necessary, adding that everyone benefits from transparency in efforts to understand the impact of these actions on the composition of the university.
2. Many GWSPH faculty are supporting salaries based on sponsored research. With the recent requirement to freeze hires and to go through the Resource Allocation Committee (RAC), researchers with sponsored funding commitments are having a difficult time making research hires quickly enough to honor those commitments. She asked whether these hires can be expedited?

President LeBlanc responded that all layoffs went through the Human Resources (HR) department, which looks at the kind of demographic data Professor Perry described; he indicated that he would follow up with HR to obtain an answer to this question. Provost Blake added that he was disappointed to hear that there are delays being experienced around sponsored research hires, as he thought 100% sponsored-research-funded hires had been fast-tracked through the RAC. He acknowledged the work that goes into preparing packets for RAC consideration. He noted that, at this point, it may be time to relax the RAC requirement for research hires and leave it in place just for staff hires.

Professor Wagner followed up on President LeBlanc's earlier comment on the Vice President for Marketing search costs, noting that the fact that an agreement was reached under which GW did not incur a cost for this search is important information. She implored the President to spend time talking with the Senate about this hire process and the resulting distress and anger in the university community around the Heather Swain hire. President LeBlanc responded that he appreciated this question and noted that this is a discussion he has been having with the FSEC Chair. Professor Wagner followed up, asking whether the discussion with the FSEC Chair precludes a discussion with the full Senate. The President responded that, at this point, this is not a discussion he would undertake in a public meeting. However, he noted that other discussions are ongoing and that he understands and absolutely appreciates the concern raised by Professor Wagner. Professor Wagner requested clarification on this statement, asking whether the President understands the concern that it is critical at this moment to have an open dialogue with the full Senate. The President responded that he understands the desire for an open dialogue with the full Senate and that there is a limit to his ability to do that.

Professor Cohen-Cole raised a point of information about whether the Senate can be moved into executive session, at which only Senators would be present. The Parliamentarian noted that the Senate rules do allow for this; it could be done by unanimous consent or by motion. However, at present, the meeting is on another agenda item. He noted that the process might be tricky in a virtual meeting format, but that it is permissible. He added that, in his thirteen years of experience

with the Senate, there has not been an executive session called. Rather, the Senate has traditionally met publicly, which can preclude some topics from discussion.

Professor Sarkar echoed Professor Perry's sentiment about representing the faculty within his school and bringing their concerns to the Senate. He reported that a School of Engineering & Applied Science (SEAS) meeting was just held where faculty were invited to bring concerns to their Senate representatives; many faculty members expressed real concerns about the future of research at GW. He noted that these faculty (and others, as heard via the latest Senate Research committee meeting) are perceiving the recent research support services reorganization and how it was implemented. He noted that, specifically, several Associate Deans for Research (ADRs) expressed that they were not involved in consultations around this reorganization. Professor Sarkar expressed his dismay at this, noting that he had raised some of the same concerns expressed by the ADRs. He added that, despite assurances to the contrary from the administration, rapid changes in this area have left faculty and staff alike feeling edgy and uncertain about whether research is still front and center at GW. He further noted that each pod has, essentially, a "lead" school. The other schools in the pod end up feeling subservient to the lead school, which leads to perceived disparities in power and priority. He expressed frustration that he hasn't been able to get a good response as to how this issue can be addressed so all schools feel their interests are being addressed equally.

Provost Blake responded that, in looking back at the implementation dates of this reorganization's implementation, actions were taken about a week earlier than initially discussed. He confirmed that there was a three-to-four week turnaround time for going through the process of the reorganization. He added, though, that there were very loose ideas of the structure heading into the implementation that led to the conclusion that it would make more sense to roll up to just one school. He noted that he did work with the ADRs in the middle to final phases of the reorganization and changed the structure with regard to the level and number of managers as well the school and central reporting structure. The Provost noted he was clear that the pods needed to be launched in one orientation but that he did not want to be prescriptive about how the pods evolve. He added that he was very open about the ability to begin with a lighter proposal-to-staff ratio but then evolve into different ratios, which might necessitate more investment. He confirmed that in this first phase of the implementation, there were very few position eliminations at the school level, with the bulk of the position eliminations coming from the central organization. Staff were allowed to compete for other positions, either lateral or more senior, within the organization, and some staff were promoted. There were many changes involved in putting the organization together, and the Provost noted that the organization as newly formed is at its very beginning point and will evolve as necessary, particularly as the university moves out of its current pandemic reality.

President LeBlanc added that it is very important to address Professor Sarkar's initial point, noting that the pandemic hasn't changed GW's commitment to its research mission one iota. Professor Sarkar noted that Provost Blake surely heard at the last Research committee meeting, that many of those who really know how research is done—particularly the ADRs—did not feel that they had been adequately consulted in this process. He described an atmosphere of chaos and confusion around the implementation. For example, he noted confusion around the final number of positions seeming to be inconsistent with what had been previously agreed upon and the lack of a clear answer about how and why this happened. He noted that, in this process, some very good people have been lost, and very good people remain who are dedicated and working long hours but are also now very demoralized. He expressed concern about a destructive impact from this process and urged the Provost to avoid this kind of disruption for seemingly small, if any, gains. Provost Blake

echoed the President's comments that he has a background as a leader in research and is fully committed to working to formulate the best structure to position GW for preeminence in research.

Professor Tekleselassie followed up on Professor Marotta-Walters's question. He noted that it is good to know tenured and tenure-track faculty members are not part of a furlough plan. He asked whether contract faculty positions are being considered for elimination as part of the budget mitigation plans and, if so, how much input chairs and program directors have into these decisions, which affect dedicated faculty members working at every level in the schools. Provost Blake responded that he meets weekly with the deans on these issues; the deans have been front and center as these matters are discussed.

Professor Khilji asked what student yield looks like, particularly for Black and first-generation college students; she additionally asked whether concrete numbers can be provided on where GW stands as a community with respect to being deliberate about diversity. Provost Blake responded that the yield (the percentage of admitted students who indicate they are coming to GW) is lower than it was last year, but this year presents many special mitigating factors. He asked Vice Provost for Enrollment and Student Success Goff to speak to this issue. Vice Provost Goff noted that he will run official "melt" data (students that deposited and then withdrew or canceled during summer) at the fall census. He added that initial melt data actually shows that the underrepresented minority melt rates held steady this year. He added that two types of melt will be calculated this year due to the high rate of deferrals. The fall census will be run after the first week in October, and data will be prepared in the weeks following the census. Full melt data should be available in November. Provost Blake confirmed that numbers from the fall census will provide the best year-over-year data for comparison. Looking at this data added to compare different population sets and making sense of those differences may show that there are shortcomings in particular populations. This year will necessarily provide abnormal numbers, but the data can be analyzed to consider these factors.

Professor Khilji asked for clarification on Vice Provost Goff's comment that the melt rate held up for underrepresented minority students after the virtual semester announcement on July 27. Vice Provost Goff responded that, when looking at the new student deposit cancellation rate, or melt rate, between July 26 and the start of Fall classes, this year's melt numbers for underrepresented students were within a half percentage point of last year's melt rate during the same period. He noted that the post-May 1 melt rate for Black students was slightly better than the previous year on July 26 and held steady even after GW's decision to go online for the fall semester. He said this year's final total new student melt rate would be higher, but much of this will be due to deferrals and not to outright cancellations. Vice Provost Goff also noted that the overall first-year new student admit-to-enroll rate would be lower than in previous years (the FY admit-to-enroll yield rate in Fall 2019 was 23.77%). He said he thought the 2020 overall new student yield rate was around 20.2% in May and that it was 19.6% on July 26 of this year, when the decision was made to go online for the fall term.

Given the significant changes caused by the Pandemic, Vice Provost Goff said Institutional Research and Enrollment and Student Success will examine yield rates in greater detail after the Fall enrollment census is completed. The data will be shared in enrollment briefings and updates when it is available later in the semester. Provost Blake added that an additional question to ask is the extent to which the university has historically considered the yield rate of waitlist admissions as opposed to the yield rate of the earlier admits, given the deeper pull than usual from the waitlist this year.

Professor Cohen-Cole requested clarification of President LeBlanc's earlier response around furloughs of tenured faculty, asking whether discussions of this possibility have taken place with any group, not just the Senate. He additionally requested, by way of a follow-up on Professor Sarkar's earlier comments, an outline of the dates by which the planning for the research pod organization was done, specifically noting as well the date the announcement of the reorganization and layoffs. President LeBlanc confirmed that no discussions on tenured or tenure-track faculty layoffs or furloughs have taken place at all, whether with the Senate, the Board of Trustees, or any other entity. Provost Blake responded to Professor Cohen-Cole's second question, noting that the first of numerous meetings on this reorganization took place in June, approximately six weeks prior to the reorganization actions. He indicated that he would provide the specific meeting dates. He noted that expansive meetings were held on this issue and acknowledged again that many of those involved would have liked more meetings and consultation.

At this point, President LeBlanc handed the virtual meeting gavel to Provost Blake to chair the meeting.

RESOLUTION 21/11: On Salary Increases Accompanying Faculty Promotions (Professor Murli Gupta, Chair, Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies Committee)

Professor Gupta returned the attached resolution to the Senate; the present resolution incorporates edits made following the August Senate meeting discussion. Professor Gupta noted that he worked with the August meeting record to ensure he incorporated input from all those who commented on the original resolution during that meeting. Changes were incorporated, and the revised resolution has now gone through review with the Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies (ASPP) committee, the FSEC, and Senators who commented on the resolution at the last meeting. He noted that the resolution was greatly improved by this input and now also includes an appendix to provide background for the resolution.

Professor Zara expressed his great appreciation for Professor Gupta and the process by which he modified the resolution with multiple contributors via email. He added that, in his work with the Educational Policy & Technology (EdPolTech) committee, he has created the verb "to Murli," which means to effectively and efficiently edit a resolution via email.

The resolution was adopted by unanimous consent.

RESOLUTION 21/12: Of Appreciation for Professor Sylvia Marotta-Walters (Professor Charles Garris)

Professor Garris read the attached resolution of appreciation into the record. The resolution was adopted by acclamation.

RESOLUTION 21/13: Of Censure of President Thomas J. LeBlanc Regarding the Appointment of Heather Swain (Professor Phil Wirtz, Member, Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies Committee)

Professor Wirtz noted that he was introducing the attached resolution with a heavy heart. He provided some background on how the Senate has arrived at this point with the attached references to the University Charter and the Title IX Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct Policy. He noted that a 2018 survey of the undergraduate population made it clear that GW wasn't creating an environment in which undergraduate students felt comfortable. A major step toward correcting this was the hire of Vice Provost Caroline Laguerre-Brown, who built a strong team focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion. One outcome of her expanded division was a thorough revision of the university's Title IX policy, which now includes the statement:

“The George Washington University is committed to maintaining a positive climate for study and work, in which individuals are judged solely on relevant factors, such as ability and performance, and can pursue their activities in an atmosphere that is free from discrimination, harassment, and violence.”

The full university community has signed on to that statement and has been working hard to ensure that this environment is a positive climate for students, faculty, and staff. With this backdrop, he noted that he must unfortunately introduce the current resolution, which comes from ASPP. ASPP, a Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate, deliberated on this resolution in view of a set of facts, which are summarized in the resolution's Whereas Clauses (WCs).

Given these facts, Professor Wirtz noted, the seemingly appropriate next step for the Senate, the full faculty, and all involved would be to request of the President a full accounting of the facts that led to Heather Swain's appointment and a clear indication that provisions are being put in place to ensure that this never happens again. Particularly in the context of the Title IX policy excerpt read earlier, the history in this matter would appear to fly in the face of the university's own policy to guarantee GW's students the kind of safety that they are entitled to expect at the university. Repeated requests have been made of the President to identify what the circumstances were that led to this terrible mistake and how the administration will ensure that it never happens again; these requests have gone unanswered, with the response to Professor Wagner's earlier question the latest example.

The university community therefore has no knowledge of what happened through the course of the search process that led to an offer being made to Ms. Swain and what controls are being put into place to prevent this from happening again. In the context of the President's refusal to provide this information, Professor Wirtz noted, the safety of GW students cannot be ensured. It is in this context that ASPP felt it necessary to present to the Senate this proposed resolution of censure. Professor Wirtz stated that, had the faculty been given any other alternative, this resolution would not be coming to the Senate today. Professor Wirtz then reviewed the resolution's four Resolving Clauses (RCs). He closed by noting that ASPP did not want to have to submit this resolution to the Senate, which represents a last resort to obtain necessary information to ensure the above Charter and Title IX policy references are upheld.

Professor Gupta commented in his capacity as chair of ASPP, affirming Professor Wirtz's position in presenting this resolution.

Professor Griesshammer spoke in favor of the resolution. He quoted President LeBlanc from the November 10, 2017, Senate meeting: “There are a number of high-profile cases regarding sexual harassment and assault occurring around the country. The University cannot afford to be loose about this and must have and implement a zero-tolerance policy in this area.” He noted that there is

often an impression that the faculty stirs unrest or that students are unruly, but, in fact, it is clear from Professor Wirtz's eloquent presentation and Professor Gupta's confirmation of that presentation that other avenues have been attempted to obtain information on this matter. He noted that it has been seventeen days since his initial statement, during which time the President could have reached out to the relevant Senate committees to work with these repeated requests for information. At some point, not making a statement becomes a statement by itself. If the Senate does not make a statement about this incident, its lack of a formal position will be rightfully used as a statement in itself. He added that this is not an isolated incident but rather reflects a pattern of administrative decisions made over the past half-year that were not based on facts or were based on faulty facts. By way of examples, he cited the 20/30 plan's presentation with incorrect STEM percentages, a lack of presented data on the impact the 20/30 plan would have on diversity, the misleading communication around the decision to discount undergraduate tuition this semester which led to some students being charged more than they would have prior to the discount, and the lack of data provided around the reorganizations of both the Academic Technologies/Information Technology and the Sponsored Research Administration areas. These examples and the current matter demonstrate that the faculty are starved of the data necessary to assess the effectiveness of administrative decisions, despite the President beginning his administration by noting he is driven by data. He expressed his concern that after the departure of the previous Provost, and since then of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the Chief Information Officer, and the Vice President for Research, there is no longer anyone in the upper levels of the administration who knows the institutional history and heart of GW, while the three top administrators have previously collaborated at a previous institution that apparently had quite different values. He closed his remarks by noting that the fact that the administration is not proactively shedding light on this incident and learning from it going forward is gravely disturbing.

Professor Cordes noted that the initial decision to appoint Ms. Swain as the new Vice President of Marketing and Communications was clearly a major misstep. He added that, as a member of ASPP, he has had a number of conversations with Professor Wirtz about this resolution and that, to his mind, the question is whether President LeBlanc's public statement on the matter is sufficient. Ultimately, he decided that it fell short, and this is why he voted to support the current resolution as a member of ASPP. He allowed that there are a number of issues raised here concerning confidentiality and legal bindings for what can be said publicly, and he suggested that one possibility would be to refer the resolution back to ASPP with clear instructions for the President to meet with ASPP and address their questions under confidentiality requirements.

Professor Tielsch agreed with Professor Cordes's suggestion and noted he had similar conversations during ASPP deliberations. He offered a detailed motion to do exactly what Professor Cordes described, indicating that he is more concerned with achieving an actual resolution to this matter rather than standing solely on principle. Specifically, Professor Tielsch moved:

“to recommit the Resolution to the ASPP Committee with instructions to report this resolution back to the Senate for the October 9 meeting and that the ASPP Committee be further instructed:

1. to seek to meet with the President in private session, with the objective of permitting the President to thoroughly, candidly, and privately speak to Resolving Clauses (2) and (3) of Resolution 21/13;

2. to advise the Senate at the October meeting whether, in the view of a majority of voting-eligible ASPP members:
 - a. the President has satisfactorily addressed Resolving Clause (2) of the Resolution (without any further need to make public the basis on which the ASPP Committee has reached that conclusion);
 - b. the President has presented ASPP with a document, to be shared with the Senate and the University community, that fully and adequately responds to Resolving Clause (3) of the Resolution; and
3. to advise the Senate at the October meeting whether, in the view of a majority of voting-eligible ASPP members, the Resolution presented at the September meeting should be debated as presented, debated with amendments as informed by ASPP's meeting with the President, or withdrawn.”

Professor Cohen-Cole raised a point of information, asking whether there is a statement in the August meeting minutes cautioning against the premature closing of debate. Professor Yezer noted that a motion to recommit is not the same as a motion to close debate. Professor Cohen-Cole raised a second point of information, asking whether the current RC2 prevents any accounting along the lines of what is described in Professor Tielsch's motion. The Parliamentarian noted that this would be a proper question to ask about the resolution but is not a proper point of information.

Professor Wilson seconded the motion, and the floor was opened to questions about the motion.

Professor Orti spoke in opposition to the motion. He noted that he is not sure what the motion is trying to accomplish that the original resolution isn't already stating. He stated that the resolution doesn't specify how an accounting should be made—this could take place in ASPP or in the full Senate. He suggested that the Senate would be sending a weak message to the university community if it sends this resolution back to ASPP. Speaking on behalf of his CCAS constituents, he expressed his support for the resolution as written.

Professor Wilson noted that the FSEC has worked very hard to obtain a public explanation for what happened in this matter and what can be done to ensure it doesn't happen again. He noted that the answer consistently received is that legal restrictions will prevent a detailed accounting from taking place. The Senate can express displeasure at a repellent event like this, but the real value comes from ensuring this type of situation never happens again. If the Senate insists on a public hearing, no response will be provided. The motion provides an avenue to explain in a confidential setting what took place; Professor Wilson expressed his opinion that the President has likely spoken candidly to the Board of Trustees on this matter, and certainly to University counsel, and that would have taken place in a private setting. An opportunity for a private accounting to a Senate committee—including the FSEC—has not yet been provided.

Professor Cohen-Cole noted that the current resolution doesn't preclude a private accounting from taking place; the Senate could pass this resolution and still obtain a private report. Professor Wilson responded that recommitting the resolution would provide a concrete, defined opportunity for the President to answer questions he has not yet answered; his impression of the current resolution is that it calls for a public accounting to the Senate. Professor Wirtz noted that he did not recognize that ASPP had put a limitation on the type of reporting required in the current resolution (in RC2) and asked which element of the resolution Professor Wilson interpreted as requiring public reporting. Professor Gupta confirmed that many meetings of ASPP are held with confidential

information that is kept confidential until such point as the principals involved are ready to bring that information into public view. He also confirmed that RC2 does not require that a full and complete accounting be made in a public setting.

Professor Yezer asked whether an accounting to a single person (for example, the FSEC Chair) with University counsel present would satisfy the requirements of the resolution; he noted that this would seem an extraordinary criterion and not what he would understand the intent of the resolution to be. Professor Wirtz suggested that the Senate needs to decide this issue and that, if RC2 isn't sufficiently narrow and needs to be made more specific, then this would lead to support for Professor Tielsch's motion. On the other hand, if that specificity isn't required, this would indicate a vote against the motion. Guidance from the Senate is required on this point. Professor Cohen-Cole asked whether RC2 could simply be amended to note that a full and complete accounting should be made to ASPP. The parliamentarian redirected the debate to the current motion; amendments to the underlying resolution can be taken up later in the debate.

Professor Marotta-Walters spoke in support of Professor Tielsch's motion to recommit, doing so on the basis of the resolution being incomplete from her perspective. She noted that RC2 is problematic in its lack of specificity; what is missing is the fact that this hiring decision and the processes that went into it represent an institutional betrayal (a well-researched term that constitutes an environment that is unsafe). She expressed that responsibility for this lies not only with the President but also with the structures that allowed this to happen and that this point is not clear enough in the current resolution. She supported recommitting to add this language.

Professor Wagner spoke against the motion, noting that the issue with RC2 can be addressed within the current Senate meeting. She stated that it is important for the Senate to take a stand on this issue. She suggested three simple questions for President LeBlanc to answer that would not cross legal counsel lines and which would allow the Senate to come to consensus on censure:

1. Prior to August 12, had President LeBlanc heard of MSU and its handling of Larry Nassar's serial sexual abuse of girls and young women at that institution?
2. Did President LeBlanc know Ms. Swain was working at MSU when he authorized her hire?
3. When did he put these two pieces of knowledge together?

She noted that the Senate is now at the point of censure and needs to act on this violation of GW's policy and community.

Professor Parsons spoke in support of recommitting the resolution. He expressed that it seems disproportionate to simultaneously try to obtain information and issue a censure, noting that it feels oddly abrupt to censure the President while still trying to obtain that information. The President may well be deserving of censure, but Professor Parsons noted that he wanted to see information on the full array of issues involved before reaching a censure decision.

Professor Cohen-Cole spoke against the motion to recommit, referencing in particular the issue of the Senate being relatively slow in responding to this issue. He referenced R. Alexander Acosta, the prosecutor who faced well-deserved scrutiny for his handling of a sex crimes case involving Jeffrey Epstein. This case came to light in December 2018, while Mr. Acosta was serving in the Trump administration, and it took another six months for the Trump administration to do anything about it. Just as President Trump should be responsible for his personnel policy, GW leadership should

have similar responsibilities, and he asked if the Senate plans to speak out about the case at hand. He reiterated that the current resolution calls for an accounting that has not yet been provided and noted that the problem with recommittal is that it allows the Senate to say it is willing to wait longer for an accounting of what happened here.

Professor Tielsch noted that the current resolution also calls for censure, not just for information, and that he would like one last chance to get some real information about the processes that went wrong before making the serious decision to censure. If that effort doesn't yield results, he noted that he would fully support a censure resolution.

Professor Griesshammer spoke against the motion to recommit, noting that the Senate has everything in hand it needs to vote on the resolution. The Senate would be censuring because the action taken violated GW's core values, and no amount of investigation will change that fact. He reiterated his earlier concern that, at some point, silence becomes its own statement. The President has to have noticed that the university community is roiling over this matter, but he has chosen not to take sufficient action or outreach in response. Further conversation could still take place behind closed doors and result in an additional resolution based on facts disclosed there. Delaying a current statement on this does not solve anything and makes a statement about the Senate's values.

Professor Johnson commented that the idea of censuring a university president when the university is under incredible stress strikes him as the Senate as shooting both the university and itself in the foot. He stated that the administration has done an amazing job in keeping the university functional and moving forward through the pandemic. Yet, the Senate seems intent on finding something to criticize within the administration, and he noted his gratitude for the administration's good decisions around handling the pandemic response, including being in the vanguard of sensible responses this summer with its decision to hold a virtual fall term. He noted that censure at this point is a bad idea and will do further damage to GW's reputation in the press.

Professor Wilson noted that were this resolution limited to RCs 1 and 4, he imagined that it would likely pass overwhelmingly. Hiring Ms. Swain was a grievous error, and everyone understands the need to determine how this happened. He stated that, if the Senate proceeds to censure without giving the President a chance to explain, no good will come of it. The Senate will have a statement on principle but will have damaged the possibility of fixing the problem and determining whether this was an error in judgment or a larger procedural issue. If good is to come of this matter, it will come from learning what went wrong and fixing it so it can't happen again. He reiterated his support for the motion, noting that the President will understand that not responding at all will certainly result in a full censure. The university can ultimately be a better place if this is addressed thoroughly.

Professor Orti followed up on Professor Griesshammer's earlier comments, noting that the Senators need to represent GW community concerns on this issue and adopt this resolution, which represents a good opportunity to dig into the background of the matter. He added that wasting a month of time is not going to help understand this better. There are two scenarios of speculation: either the President didn't know about the concerns around Ms. Swain (which raises questions of due diligence), or he did know about these concerns and offered Ms. Swain the position in spite of this knowledge (which is its own clear problem). He noted that he would like to hear from his Senate colleagues any alternative scenarios that would lead to something other than censure, stating that he did not believe anything beyond one or the other of these scenarios would be learned. He affirmed

the need to send a strong message now that the Senate is with the GW community's clear position on this issue; waiting a month to do so will not serve the community.

Professor Sarkar observed the clear passion on both sides of the present discussion. He echoed what Professor Wilson said earlier, noting that the Senate could censure on RCs 1 and 4, as there seems to be large agreement on these points. However, if this is not done thoroughly and properly, the Senate will prove derelict in the same way the current resolution says the President is derelict. Censure is a major step; today's debate shows clear agreement on the central issue of this matter, specifically, the egregious nature of this appointment, the lack of thoughtfulness around it, and the concern around a repeat incident. The current motion demonstrates that the Senate is not derelict in its own duty; if Senate members are unsure about RCs 2 and 3, this needs to be considered. He noted that everyone agrees this hire was a terrible decision, and it is not giving anyone a pass by recommitting to a committee session where more information can be obtained. He closed by noting that being deliberate about this will send the right message and expressed his support for the motion.

Professor Mylonas noted his agreement with some of the arguments made by both sides of the debate. He posed a question about the motion, asking whether there is any indication that a response would be forthcoming from the administration, that wasn't there before, should the resolution be recommitted. If so, recommitment would be worth considering. In this sense, he wondered whether the resolution can be deployed as a bargaining tool to obtain more information. However, he asked, even if there were to be a private meeting and accounting, how would this then be disseminated and influence GW policy, given that the meeting's contents would still be confidential? Professor Wilson responded that he has been in conversation with trustees, and his understanding is that they will encourage President LeBlanc to be forthcoming with ASPP if the resolution is recommitted to that committee. He expressed that a conversation about what can be done to prevent a similar incident going forward can be public. A conversation around what actually took place has implications for any current litigation and likely needs to remain confidential. He noted that Professor Wagner's suggested questions would shape any pending litigation and could not likely be answered in a public forum. Professor Wagner noted that, if the President had no knowledge of the MSU/Nassar situation, that would represent a failing of leadership.

Professor Garris expressed his agreement with Professor Wagner's earlier points in the sense that the Larry Nassar situation at MSU is one of the worst things ever to happen in higher education; anyone connected with it is stained. He noted that it is true that Ms. Swain was at MSU during that era and in the position of Vice President of Communications. He agreed that hiring a Vice President of Communications from this institution was a huge mistake in light of the subsequent reaction on campus, as was stated by President LeBlanc. He agreed with motion to recommit and raised some issues to consider when the resolution returns to ASPP. Professor Garris noted that the independent special counsel's report in the Nassar matter, which states that "MSU has fostered a culture of indifference to sexual assault motivated by its desire to protect its reputation," indicates that Ms. Swain was not implicated in any illegal wrongdoing around the discovery process in the Nassar situation but rather identified as having advised an individual of their executive privilege. The report cites her action as an example of a wider practice at MSU of anti-transparency but does not implicate her in the Nassar matter. The resolution, Professor Garris stated, takes the statement out of context and implies that Ms. Swain was directly implicated or accused when the independent counsel's report does not make this assertion. He added that the use of the term "core values of the university" in WC7 is a slippery slope in Senate resolutions and that any core values at the university are defined by the *Faculty Code* and academic freedom. He suggested that the WCs should more

clearly define what the administration is accused of doing, which was, as he heard Professor Wagner's comments, taking a tone-deaf action by hiring someone at a very high level from an institution with this issue in its immediate history.

Professor Wagner responded that she was not speaking about tone deafness when referring to core values but rather to community and caring for that community. Ms. Swain was working as Vice President of Communications and Branding Strategy and was invited to work for GW in a parallel capacity. The decision to hire her represents a refusal to care for the GW community by not being aware, whether of the facts around the situation, the fact that the community would not be upset by the hire, or both. She asked whether ASPP members serving on the Senate might provide some input into possible changes to RC2. Professor Gupta responded ASPP would be willing to consider amendments to RC2, but the current motion needs to be addressed first.

Professor Cohen-Cole proposed an amendment to the motion, adding a fourth instruction to ASPP to indicate whether they are unsatisfied by the responses received. Professor Tielsch noted that the motion already provides for this in the third instruction to ASPP, and the Parliamentarian confirmed the motion's requirement to bring the resolution back to the Senate at its October 9 meeting. Professor Cohen-Cole withdrew his amendment.

Professor Zara noted that his sense of the debate is that there is a concern that a recommittal of the resolution might give the impression that the Senate doesn't have an opinion on Ms. Swain's hire. To address this, he suggested a statement at the beginning of the motion to confirm the Senate's affirmation of this hire as a mistake while still asking for more information. Professor Gupta responded that the clear sentiment of the Senate can be taken from the minutes of this meeting.

A vote on the motion to recommit passed 22-11.

UPDATE: Title IX Policy Revision (Professor Ed Swaine, Co-Chair, Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee)

Professor Swaine provided a brief update on the recent Title IX policy revision process, which has now concluded. He summarized the history of the revision process, noting that, this past spring, the Department of Education released new Title IX regulations and required that they be put into effect by August 14. Working under this extremely short timeline, Vice Provost for Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement Laguerre-Brown shared with Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) partial and complete policy drafts. PEAF and one of its subcommittees provided extensive remarks and met with Vice Provost Laguerre-Brown and others in the administration several times. In July, Vice Provost Laguerre-Brown spoke to the Senate about the policy revisions and took questions. The revised policy was presented to the Board of Trustees on an expedited timetable and was approved just ahead of the federally mandated deadline of August 14.

Professor Swaine noted that the university's Title IX policy is very important for some of the reasons that have been discussed in today's meeting and for maintaining a campus free of discrimination, harassment, and violence. It involves a lot of difficult choices about how best to accomplish this. Some of those choices, as the Senate was informed in July, were largely taken out of the university's hands by the nature of the Department of Education's new Title IX regulations. In other respects, GW had more space and flexibility. In general, the university retained its preexisting

policy where there was no evidence that it was working poorly or where there was evidence that it was working well. PEAFF and the subcommittee supported key choices made by the administration in revising the policy, and their suggested changes received due consideration. On the whole, Professor Swaine noted, this was a good example of shared governance under some stringent conditions. The new policy has been [posted publicly](#). PEAFF will remain engaged with this topic and will make further reports if perceived difficulties arise or if it feels further revisions to the policy should receive scrutiny by the Senate.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. Nominations for election of new members to Senate standing committees

The following nominations of standing committee members were approved by unanimous consent:

- Fiscal Planning and Budgeting: Majeda El-Banna (SON/voting), Susan Kulp (GWSB/voting), and Terry Murphy (CCAS/voting)⁴
- Educational Policy & Technology: Nicole Cennamo (student/voting), Jay Goff (Provost/nonvoting), and Terry Murphy (CCAS/voting)

The following additional nominations from the floor were made:

- Appointments, Salary, & Public Policy: Elizabeth Anker (CCAS/voting), Sarah Wagner (CCAS/voting), Harald Griesshammer (CCAS/voting)
- Fiscal Planning and Budgeting: Michael Abramowicz (LAW/voting)
- Educational Policy & Technology: Ben Toll (Dean of Admissions/nonvoting), Jamie Cohen-Cole (CCAS/voting)

A discussion took place on nomination procedures for Senate standing committees after an unusual number of nominations were made from the floor at today's meeting. Concerns raised included the need for committee chairs to be able to consider a balanced committee membership that achieves as much diversity as possible with regard to school representation, academic discipline, rank, gender, and ethnicity. As provided in the *Faculty Organization Plan*, however, nominations for Senate committee membership may be made from the floor of the Senate by any Senate member.

A suggestion was made that nominations by Senate members receive the endorsement of the committee chair before proceeding to approval by the full Senate. Professor Wirtz suggested that the FSEC discuss creating defined procedures for committee nominations; he noted that this would allow for a more deliberate consideration of committee balance and, given today's recommittal of Resolution 21/13 to ASPP, would avoid the perception that a committee is being inflated ahead of a key meeting. Professor Sarkar also encouraged the Senate to keep to its procedures so it cannot be accused of doing what it faults the administration for

⁴ These nominations were approved at the August 21 meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) after a quorum was lost at the August 14 Faculty Senate meeting. The Senate is being asked today to accept the approval of these nominations by the FSEC.

doing. Professor Wilson responded that he would be happy to discuss this issue with the FSEC at its next regular meeting. The Parliamentarian affirmed that the nomination actions taken today, while slightly unusual for the Senate's usual practice, are within the bounds of the rules. Professor Yezer affirmed the need for defined procedures given the broader interest in serving on Senate committees.

Following a review of the ASPP membership list by Professor Gupta and in light of this discussion, Professor Griesshammer declined his nomination.

The floor nominations, with the exception of Professor Griesshammer's, were approved by unanimous consent.

II. Reports of the Standing Committees

None.

III. Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Arthur Wilson, Chair

Professor Wilson reviewed the attached report. He noted that, when the President is ready to begin a search for a new Vice President for Research, the FSEC has a list of faculty members interested in serving on this search committee.

IV. Provost's Remarks

- Jessica Krug has resigned her position at GW, effective immediately. The chair of the History department, Professor Dan Schwartz, was able to identify replacement instructors for the courses she would have taught this spring very quickly, and the Provost expressed his gratitude for his quick work in this matter. The Provost acknowledged the seriousness of this issue as well as the pain of the university community around it, and he encouraged individuals in need of support to reach out to the university's [Office of Advocacy and Support](#) or the faculty and staff [Wellbeing Hotline](#).
- The Provost reported that, on the 90th day of his tenure in his previous positions, he has attempted to put forth a set of priorities as a starting point for discussions on areas of focus. This is a frame for some of the deans' priorities as well as for ideas about which the Provost is particularly passionate. He noted that he has shared a preliminary and evolving draft list with the deans, the FSEC, the Provost staff, and others. He referenced last year's strategic planning process and indicated that some of these ideas come from discussions held during that process. He indicated that he doesn't want to stagnate as the university moves through this pandemic period and wants to give the deans and the whole community an opportunity to move forward, using information within the draft strategic planning reports as launching points. He indicated that he would send a wider message on these priorities very soon. He thanked the FSEC for their candid feedback and noted that an upcoming message to the university community on this list of priorities will request and provide a link for feedback. Among the priorities under discussion are:
 - Identifying opportunities to study and infuse diversity and inclusivity in GW's academic programs;

- Holding conversations about what a post-COVID-19 university will look like and how to be planning for this now;
- Becoming bolder and more distinctive in the arts, humanities, and social sciences; in engineering and science; and in pre-healthcare disciplines; and
- Working with the College of Professional Studies (CPS) on expanding offerings in credentialing and training ahead of the expected reduction in the number of high school graduates anticipated in five years.

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Professor Griesshammer reminded the Provost that the strategic planning process was halted and not concluded and that conclusions cannot be drawn from its preliminary reports. If that process is being restarted, then the committees should be instructed to finalize their reports, which includes accounting for the cornucopia of robust and detailed input provided in response to the draft reports. It is only once final reports have been issued that discussions around implementation can begin. He cautioned the Provost to be extremely wary of holding preliminary discussions with deans or administrators around the implementation of a plan that doesn't exist. He urged the Provost to follow the scientific process, namely to rely on data to reach conclusions, not the other way around. He expressed concern that the administration is making the same mistake now that it made last fall around strategic planning and that deliberations on priorities the Provost puts forward now are being based on a nonexistent strategic plan. He noted that it is not the job of the administration to direct the university's mission and vision without the support of faculty, students, and staff.

Professor Sarkar expressed muted agreement with Professor Griesshammer's comments. He noted that he comes to deliberations with an open mind and no reason to believe that other involved parties aren't also invested in the best interest of the university, but there must be effective buy-in from all constituencies. Unfortunately, he said, looking back, the processes to date have made the faculty very edgy, and he urged the administration to be careful about messaging and perceptions. While expressing his belief that the Provost is bringing good intentions to this process, he noted that the faculty are exhausted from managing a huge upheaval to their normal way of doing things and frequently feel disconnected from decisions made by school and university administrators. This needs to be taken into account when determining how to communicate and proceed. He added that he would like to take part in truly effective shared governance, which requires proceeding carefully with clear communication.

Professor Zara noted that when he discussed moving forward on academic priorities with the Provost, he was an advocate for not neglecting the now-suspended strategic planning process. He clarified that he was referring to the four pillars, which involved committees of faculty colleagues across campus who spent hundreds of hours polling the university community on numerous issues. The process may be paused at present, but it still took place and yielded a lot of information that shouldn't be wasted. Professor Griesshammer responded that this is indeed the spirit of his comment; any resumed planning should be brought to fruition in a deliberate, consultative manner. He stated that he is hearing the Provost say that he is listening but is plowing ahead. The Provost responded that he is listening to determine whether there are ways to move forward. He noted that he took today's comments to mean that there should be some conclusion to the paused strategic

planning process before anything is done to move forward, aside from actions that might be more directly related to operational considerations. Professor Griesshammer agreed that this would be a wise decision.

Professor Sarkar applauded the Provost for sharing his thinking processes and priorities with the faculty. He appreciated this transparency but urged the administration to be cautious about how its actions are being perceived by an already stressed and edgy faculty who are worried about how they will be impacted; initiatives cannot be implemented in a top-down manner.

Professor Wagner urged the Provost to consider the Senate's Resolution 21/7 on diversity, equity, and inclusion and to about what can be done in the here and now to improve the environment around diversity as he considers his list of priorities. She noted that those who authored 21/7 would be happy to participate in this work. Provost Blake responded that this work is absolutely continuing regardless of how his priorities list evolves, and he noted that his priority on diversity cites the Senate resolution Professor Wagner mentioned.

Professor Cohen-Cole affirmed Professor Zara's and Professor Griesshammer's points about the enormous amount of work that went into the strategic planning process last year and that this work was not completed. He added that there was significant commentary from the Senate and the broader faculty about the ways in which the work done in the strategic planning committees was constrained by the required assumption underlying their work that there would be a 20% reduction in the student body. Some of the preliminary reports specifically reference this constraint and the committees' concerns that they would be able to accomplish strategic plan goals with that constraint in place. He suggested that rolling back this underlying assumption should be part of any conversation going forward, and he encouraged the Provost to make consultation with faculty a central part of conversations about enrollments. Provost Blake replied by noting his agreement that faculty should be a central part of conversations about enrollments. Professor Wilson asked whether the strategic planning committee chairs might be asked to complete their reports free of the constraint of the 20/30 plan as an underlying assumption.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:58pm.

Questions from Professor Griesshammer to Provost Blake (introduced at the August Senate meeting and reiterated at the September Senate meeting) and Provost Blake's responses (via email to Professor Griesshammer on September 25)

1. How much in savings is the Sponsored Research Administration restructuring projected to realize in FY2021 and FY2022?

\$1.7 million (This includes the Sponsor Programs Administration only including both eliminations and the release of vacancies).

2. How much in savings is the Academic Technologies and Information Technology restructuring projected to realize in FY2021 and FY2022?

This has not been finalized. Jonathan Fozard would need to give you this once they finish the reorganization. The reason is similar to research. I created higher paying positions as a part of developing the PODS organization chart, so straight elimination numbers would not be accurate with respect to calculating savings.

3. Will likely upcoming salary cuts apply to postdocs and other personnel who are fully funded by external sources?

This is not relevant, at this point, given the President's announcement that across-the-board salary cuts will not occur.

4. Where does the SRA restructuring leave the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR)?

The Office lost about 7 staff members total. Although central staff will operate within PODS, they will continue to report (from a performance standpoint) to OVPR for now.

5. Can the administration enumerate three issues on which it changed its original plan following faculty and dean feedback?

Here are several from the top of my head:

- My hire of the Senior Associate Provost of Special Projects was only after extensive conversation with the FSEC. While I wanted a Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives, they told me it could not be that role and that they would prefer that it not have "Strategic" in the title. I hired her later based on the level and the position name that they recommended verbatim. Although she interviewed in December, I spoke with the FSEC in January and hired in February; she started in March just before the freeze and was published after the freeze. There have been assertions that she was hired unilaterally after the hiring freeze which is patently incorrect.
- The Educational Policy and Technology Committee challenged an earlier decision to remove the Study Abroad director; I reversed that immediately.
- The RAC Review committee (including you as Library Advisory Committee chair) challenged the Library positions deferrals (which I had previously deferred) and also

challenged the fact the instructional designers and instructional technologists were IT staff (which I had previously stipulated). I reversed both.

- The FSEC requested that faculty representatives be put on Fall planning; they also requested a faculty member on the RAC (I went further and created a special RAC Review for Faculty Senators before decisions were made), and that the President/Provost/EVP pre-notify Faculty Senate representatives before major decisions. These were all completed and represented the creation of new processes.
 - Members of the Faculty Senate Research Committee requested that more than one manager be included in each Research POD, and I complied.
 - The Faculty Senate insisted that the President and Board use resources to offset financial mitigation; that was done.
 - The Educational Policy and Technology committee demanded that the move to Microsoft 360 be delayed or canceled; Mark Diaz complied.
 - Although the policy for requesting teaching accommodations was just a “process,” the Faculty insisted that I be clear that “no faculty would be forced in the classroom.” Professor Roddis even gave talking points, which I followed verbatim to reassure the faculty.
 - As Provost, I spoke separately with each of the department chairs in CCAS and several Faculty Senators about the appointment of Dean Wahlbeck considering my arrival after the search. Listening closely to feedback, I appointed him into the permanent role.
6. How does the administration plan to evaluate the success of the SRA reorganization, and when will the results of this evaluation be available?

The POD leadership will develop an advisory committee. As you can imagine, I want this to succeed. The POD leaders know that I will favor requests to strengthen the PODs as we settle in.

Questions from Professor Griesshammer to the administration (introduced at the September Senate meeting) and Provost Blake’s post-meeting responses (via email to Professor Griesshammer on October 5)

7. How many staff members have been laid off since March 2020?

This question is best answered by the university’s Finance leadership. The question is complex given eliminations as well as voluntary separations. It is also complicated by separating natural business-oriented separations from those associated with mitigation.

8. Given that law is one of GW’s strongest areas, what signal does it send if the university lays off the only pre-law advisor at GW?

I don’t believe it signals much as the lay-off was part of a plan by CCAS leadership to move to shared pre-law advising as opposed to just one advisor. I was encouraged by this response on the Overhead at GW Facebook page:

“I met with the current pre-law advising team and I was quite satisfied. One of the people that has been enlisted to cover the load was the Pre-Law advisor before the one that just got terminated. Obviously there is a lot that isn’t ideal with the situation but (and I can’t believe I am saying this) schedule an appointment and give CCAS pre-law advising a chance. It was easily the best experience I have had in my entire time with CCAS Advising (I had an appointment scheduled with the pre-law advisor right before the position was terminated)”

9. The stated \$180 million budget gap is what would be incurred if GW remains in the virtual realm all year; are current mitigation strategies working toward this full target, or is there a plan to delay some decisions until more information is available about the spring semester?

So much has changed with the overall targets given the Board’s allocation of resources. There is no clear way to answer this without a longer statement of where we have been and how that relates to where we are. We have shared each step with the Senate through the summer.

10. Where do discussions stand about the limited role of increased endowment payouts to help mitigate budget shortfalls?

I think the Board allowed for resource use. Is this related to the spirit of your question?

11. When will faculty and administration see evidence that suggests the restructuring of the Academic Technologies/Information Technology and research administrative support service areas actually addressed existing problems or issues in a meaningful way supported by data?

I am working on developing a working group to help with School/College IT support and Classroom IT support which now is a part of GWIT. Academic Technologies initially did include Instructional Design and Instructional Technologies; both continue to report to LAI on the Provost hierarchy.



**A RESOLUTION ON SALARY INCREASES ACCOMPANYING FACULTY PROMOTIONS
(21/11)**

WHEREAS, The Faculty Code¹ states that “As general practice, a promotion shall be accompanied by an appropriate increase in salary”; and

WHEREAS, the amount of savings resulting from denying promotion increases this year is estimated to be about \$500,000, a small percentage of total tenured faculty compensation; and

WHEREAS, while the faculty recognizes and greatly appreciates the contributions to the university by staff, rewarding faculty achieving promotions is a contractual obligation that is essential if the University is serious about striving to be a preeminent urban research university; and

WHEREAS, promotional increases are part of a long-term implicit contract with faculty to reward those whose efforts have met or exceeded predetermined criteria; and

WHEREAS, failure to award appropriate increases upon promotion can permanently distort the relative compensation of otherwise identical tenured faculty;

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

- 1) That the University must continue to reward faculty who are promoted this year with appropriate increases in salary and provide notification of these increases, consistent with the spirit of the *Faculty Code*, as expeditiously as possible, and if the salary increases are not provided at the promotion date, then retroactively to that date as early as possible; and
- 2) That, in the event that present financial constraints do not leave sufficient funds immediately available to support raises for faculty who have been recently awarded promotion, the university must make these raises available prior to awarding any bonuses, restoring any pay cuts, increasing any salary of, or in any way increasing the compensation (deferred or otherwise) of any other non-newly-promoted faculty member or any administration official; and
- 3) That the sizes of salary increases should be designed to be competitive with market basket institutions and considered part of a long-term budget process rather than related to fluctuations in cash flow or operating results in any given year.

Senate Committee on Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policies
August 28, 2020

Adopted by the Faculty Senate
September 11, 2020

¹ Faculty Code, Article IV B3, page 11

Appendix: Resolution Background

These are trying times when the pandemic is causing all kinds of problems at the nation's colleges and universities that have had to cut their operating budgets by freezing salaries, reducing or eliminating retirement contributions, introducing layoffs and furloughs, and introducing cuts to salaries and compensation. In the midst of this pandemic, the university is still tenuring and promoting faculty who have been vetted by their peers and then college/school committees, deans and provosts. According to the Faculty Code: "As general practice, a promotion shall be accompanied by an appropriate increase in salary". There is an expectation that a faculty member, newly promoted, would receive an appropriate increase in his/her base salary as stated by the implicit contract between the faculty and the university.

This year, for the first time in anyone's memory, the letters of promotion have not included any rise in salaries. The faculty believe that they have a Code-prescribed right to appropriate increases. It is also recognized that the university is in a tough financial situation and needs to cut costs. However, a cost of \$500,000 is small compared to the overall budget of the university and the faculty believe that the university should be able to find this kind of money in its budget. We further recognize that such funds may not be available at this time and ask that (1) the university provide notifications to the promoted faculty that their increases would be forthcoming in the near future, (2) that these raises would be made available before the university awards any bonuses and restores any cuts in compensation of any administration official, and (3) that these increases will be retroactive to the dates of promotion.

During the course of the discussion at the Faculty Senate meeting of August 14, and during subsequent discussions between several faculty members, it was stated that this seems to be a "tone-deaf" situation where the staff are being laid-off while the faculty is demanding pay increases for this unique group of faculty. However, we note that the Senate is in strong support for similar treatment of the staff, but we also recognize that the Senate's formal jurisdiction is defined by the Faculty Code, which prescribes the limits of the current Resolution.

The fact remains that the faculty who are newly promoted this year need to have an increase in their base salaries in the absence of which their relative compensation will be permanently distorted. Promotion in rank is one of three key events in the careers of faculty members thus while we highly respect and value staff and their contributions, the faculty promotion is different because it is an essential component to the academic process and the search for excellence in teaching, research and service which will lead to the University's goal of preeminence. This faculty group has been evaluated by peers, by a faculty committee, deans, and academic VP and certified as deserving of a contractual promise.

In summary, the Whereas clauses lay out the case for this Resolution.

- Resolving Clause 1 establishes the default principle that the university must continue to reward faculty who are promoted this year. Further, we ask that the promotion salary increases should be made retroactively to the date of promotion.
- Resolving Clause 2 recognizes that the appropriate funds may not be immediately available and asks that these raises must be made before reversing any of the cuts for administration officials.
- Resolving Clause 3 establishes the fundamental position that these salary increases should not be considered as solutions to a short-term problem we are facing in the current year.

Respectfully submitted,
Murli M. Gupta

Chair, Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policy (ASPP)
August 28, 2020



Faculty Senate

A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR PROFESSOR SYLVIA MAROTTA-WALTERS (21/12)

WHEREAS, Professor Sylvia Marotta-Walters has earned the highest level of respect, gratitude, and admiration of her colleagues on the Faculty Senate as well as the esteem and appreciation of the entire University community; and

WHEREAS, Professor Marotta-Walters's term of continuous service as Chair of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate reached its three-year limit under the Faculty Organization Plan in April 2020; and,

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees of the George Washington University unanimously passed a Resolution recognizing Professor Marotta-Walters's service on May 20, 2020, honoring her work with the Senate, Administration, and Board on multiple initiatives, including the most recent Faculty Code revision process; and,

WHEREAS, Sylvia Marotta-Walters served in the position of Chair of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and displayed extreme dedication to practicing shared governance among the faculty, staff, and administration at a difficult period of transition in Presidential leadership and in university culture and worked extremely hard to resolve differences and facilitate a cooperative shared governance environment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY THAT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT OF APPRECIATION BE ISSUED:

In recognition of the wide range of outstanding contributions to The George Washington University and its faculty and students made by Professor Sylvia Marotta-Walters during her remarkable tenure of nearly twenty-eight years as Professor of Counseling in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, during which time she has consistently adhered to the highest standards of excellence in her teaching, scholarship, and service, as evidenced by her election to Fellow, American Counseling Association; Fellow, American Psychological Association Society of Counseling Psychology; appointment as Past-President, American Psychological Association Trauma Psychology Division; and receipt of the 2016 Oscar and Shoshana Trachtenberg Prize for Service; and

Especially in recognition of the extraordinary contributions Professor Marotta-Walters has made to the University and its faculty through her thus far thirteen years of exemplary service as a member of the Faculty Senate – including three years as Chair of the Executive Committee, as well as numerous years of chairing or serving as a member of, among others, the Faculty Senate Research, Honors and Academic Convocations, Libraries, Physical Facilities, and the Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policy Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate – during which time she has compiled a remarkable record of major accomplishments due to her inspired leadership, integrity, collegiality, diplomacy, fairness, kindness, patience, perseverance, and grace under fire, as well as her unwavering commitment to advancing the best interests of the University and its faculty and students through a process of careful analysis, reasoned dialogue, shared governance, and deliberation;

THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY HEREBY EXPRESSES ITS DEEPEST ADMIRATION, APPRECIATION AND GRATITUDE TO PROFESSOR SYLVIA MAROTTA-WALTERS FOR HER DISTINGUISHED SERVICE.

Adopted by Acclamation
September 11, 2020

Thomas J. LeBlanc
President



**A RESOLUTION OF CENSURE OF PRESIDENT THOMAS J. LEBLANC
REGARDING THE APPOINTMENT OF HEATHER SWAIN (21/13)**

WHEREAS, Article IX.A (“Faculty Role in Decision Making”) of the *Faculty Code*¹ states that “The regular faculty shares with the officers of administration the responsibility for effective operation of the departments and schools and the university as a whole”; and

WHEREAS, On August 12, 2020, GW Today announced that President Thomas LeBlanc had appointed Ms. Heather Swain to the position of Vice President for Communications and Marketing²; and

WHEREAS, On August 15, 2020, President LeBlanc announced that Ms. Swain had withdrawn her acceptance of the position of Vice President for Communications and Marketing³; and

WHEREAS, Two years prior to the appointment of Ms. Swain, media sources reported that “prosecutors found that Heather Swain, [Michigan State University’s] vice president for communications, told a trustee to copy in the university’s attorney just so the thread could be hidden from investigators.”⁴; and

WHEREAS, The media reports were verified by the 2018 *Independent Special Counsel’s Investigation into Michigan State University’s Handling of the Larry Nassar Matter*, which determined that “Vice President for Communications and Brand Strategy, Heather Swain, directed Trustee Brian Breslin to copy University legal counsel Robert Noto on an email to other Trustees in order to ‘maintain privilege,’ despite the fact that the email was not seeking any type of legal advice from Noto”⁵; and

¹ <https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/blogs.gwu.edu/dist/0/196/files/2019/08/Faculty-Code-May-2019.pdf>

² *GW Today*, “Heather Swain Named Vice President for Communications and Marketing,” August 12, 2020, <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/heather-swain-named-vice-president-communications-and-marketing>.

³ *GW Today*, “Update on Vice President for Communications and Marketing,” August 15, 2020, <https://gwtoday.gwu.edu/update-vice-president-communications-and-marketing>

⁴ See, for example, David K. Li, “Michigan State University Has Stonewalled Larry Nassar Investigation, Prosecutors Say,” *NBC News*, December 21, 2018, <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/michigan-state-university-has-stonewalled-larry-nassar-investigation-prosecutors-say-n950951>; and

⁵ State of Michigan Department of Attorney General, “Status of the Independent Special Counsel’s Investigation into Michigan State University’s Handling of the Larry Nassar Matter,” December 21, 2018, https://www.michigan.gov/documents/ag/MSU_Investigation_Status_Update_final.redacted_JOB_644663_7.pdf

WHEREAS, On August 25, 2020, President LeBlanc sent an email to the Members of the GW Community which apologized and took responsibility for the appointment of Ms. Swain but which failed to provide a full account of the process that led to the appointment of Ms. Swain or of the safeguards being implemented as a result to avoid similar mistakes in the future; and

WHEREAS, The appointment of Ms. Swain, in the light of the Special Counsel's Investigation, was totally inconsistent with the core values of The George Washington University; and

WHEREAS, The President, as the administrative leader of the University, has a fundamental responsibility to ensure that appropriate vetting procedures are followed with all University appointments, especially those of high-level officers;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY THAT

- (1) The Faculty Senate of The George Washington University hereby censures President Thomas J. LeBlanc for violating the core principles of The George Washington University in appointing Heather Swain to the position of Vice President for Communications and Marketing; and
- (2) The Faculty Senate calls upon President LeBlanc to provide a full and complete accounting of the vetting process that resulted in the appointment of Ms. Swain; and
- (3) The Faculty Senate calls upon President LeBlanc to present for Senate review and amendment a process for vetting all subsequent high-level administrative officer appointments that will ensure the core values of the University are never again abrogated; faculty members not presently holding an administrative appointment should be included in this vetting process; and
- (4) The Faculty Senate recommends that this censure be sustained by the Board of Trustees of The George Washington University.

Senate Committee on Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policies
August 30, 2020

**RESOLUTION OF CENSURE OF PRESIDENT
THOMAS J. LEBLANC
REGARDING THE APPOINTMENT OF
HEATHER SWAIN (21/13)**

The George Washington University
Faculty Senate Committee on Appointments,
Salary, and Promotion Policy

University Charter

The purposes of the University are —

1. to educate individuals in liberal arts, languages, sciences, learned professions, and other courses and subjects of study,
2. to conduct scholarly research and publish the findings of such research,
3. to operate hospital and medical facilities, and
4. to engage in any activity incidental to the foregoing purposes.
Such purposes shall be accomplished without regard to the race, color, creed, sex, or national origin of any individual. (emphasis added)

https://trustees.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs2786/f/downloads/GW%20Charter_1.pdf

Title IX Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct Policy

“The George Washington University is committed to maintaining a positive climate for study and work, in which individuals are judged solely on relevant factors, such as ability and performance, and can pursue their activities in an atmosphere that is free from discrimination, harassment, and violence.”

<https://compliance.gwu.edu/title-ix-sexual-harassment-and-related-conduct-policy>



Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)
September 11, 2020
Arthur Wilson, Chair

Shared Governance

- Naming Committees: Professor Roger Fairfax has begun to move forward on the Marvin Center naming taskforce. They have a website and are interested in feedback from the university community. They are also planning a series of town halls to solicit comments in the next few days. The Colonials moniker taskforce, chaired by Professor Mary Cheh, is also reportedly meeting. They have a website and are interested in feedback from the university community.
- Shared services task forces
 - The faculty on the Academic Technologies/Information Technology taskforce has consistently questioned the need for the changes proposed by the administration. While the meetings were informative about administration plans to centralize technology services, the rationale remains unclear. The administration has acknowledged that any budget savings from this restructuring will be modest, perhaps \$5 million/year if all goes well. Despite concern that the start of GW's first fully online semester is a bad time to be restructuring technology services, and near universal feedback from the schools that their AT/IT experience has been good, the administration claims the existing configuration led to anecdotal reports of "service deficiencies;" these remain poorly documented despite repeated requests. Now that classes are underway, already, anecdotal reports of technology related difficulties suggest that this restructuring and the resulting confusion is off to a worrisome start.
 - The faculty on the Research shared services taskforce were disappointed to see Robert Miller leave his post as Vice President for Research, having been promoted to a position in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences. A faculty advisory group on his replacement has been readied. To our knowledge, the Provost has not yet begun a search for Robert Miller's replacement.
 - No new developments on the other shared services taskforces—those concerned with advising, career services, campus spaces, or marketing and communications—have been communicated, although each of these areas has apparently been hit with significant layoffs.
- The FSEC is considering a faculty evaluation of the President's performance. The trustees are expected to evaluate the president's performance later this academic year; a faculty-led evaluation would complement trustee efforts. To ensure timeliness, the goal is to complete this evaluation during the Fall semester. A suitable survey instrument has already been prepared. The FSEC would now like to solicit volunteers with the expertise to help

distribute and analyze the results. Anyone interested in assisting with this effort should contact Shaista Kihlji or Arthur Wilson by September 25.

Senate Responses to University Actions

Faculty frustration with the administration remains high, with several open letters and petitions from multiple schools circulating (CCAS, ESIA, GWSB, etc.) and calling for changes ranging from pausing administrative plans to calling for no confidence votes. Tentative discussions between the Provost and members of the FSEC on how to better operationalize shared governance are taking place.

The FSEC met on August 17, 21, 27, 30, and September 4. The August 21 meeting was the regularly scheduled FSEC meeting at which the September Senate agenda was established. The additional meetings were convened on a number of pressing issues, including the administration's decision to hire Heather Swain, possible compensation actions as part of the collection of budget mitigation strategies, and a discussion with Provost Blake on his office's priorities.

Coming into this period, the administration continued to assert that the university faces more than a \$200 million budget shortfall compared to previous expectations for the coming fiscal year. Since previous efforts are thought to have produced \$115 million in savings, the administration proposed substantial furloughs, and compensation reductions in addition to suspending the university portion of retirement contributions. The FSEC chose not to endorse the administration's proposals. The Senate Fiscal Planning & Budgeting in particular has been extremely busy. A delegation from the Faculty Senate that included Professors Cordes, Galston, Tielsch and Wilson, as well as Professor Kulp of the GW School of Business, met with trustees arguing for a different approach, partly due to the fact that enrollment data have begun to look better than initially projected over the last several months. This group also called for a modest level of support from the endowment. A formal response has not yet been received from either the trustees or the administration, although board meetings are scheduled for the next several weeks. Other approaches are also being explored by the Senate Budget committee.

Personnel Actions

There are no grievances at the university.

Calendar

The next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is September 29, 2020; this meeting was originally scheduled for September 25 but was rescheduled to accommodate the Board of Trustees' shifted fall meeting schedule. All agenda items to be considered by the FSEC for the October 9 Faculty Senate agenda should be submitted to Liz one week prior to the September 29 FSEC meeting.