



Faculty Senate

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SENATE MEETING HELD ON MARCH 4, 2022 VIA WEBEX

Present: President Wrighton, Provost Bracey; Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair Wilson; Parliamentarian Binder; Registrar Amundson; Senate Staffers Liz Carlson and Jenna Chaojareon; Deans Ayres, Bass, Feuer, Goldman, Henry, Lach, Mehrotra, and Wahlbeck; Interim Deans Feuer and Slaven-Lee; Professors Agnew, Baird, Clarke, Cohen-Cole, Cordes, El-Ghazawi, Galston, Garris, Griesshammer, Grynawski, Gupta, Gutman, Johnson, Joubin, Khilji, Kulp, Kurtzman, Marotta-Walters, McHugh, Mylonas, Parsons, Prasad, Roddis, Sarkar, Schultheiss, Tekleselassie, Tielsch, Vyas, Wagner, Wirtz, Yezer, and Zeman.

Absent: Dean Matthew; Professors Borum, Briggs, Kieff, Lewis, Lill and Vonortas.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:02p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The [minutes](#) of the February 18, 2022, Faculty Senate meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Mark Wrighton, President)

President Wrighton opened his report by noting that he has received extremely positive feedback to the announcement at the February 18 Senate meeting that Chris Bracey has been appointed as Provost. He added that this was the first of what he hoped would be several key appointments in the near future. Dean searches are taking place in the College of Professional Studies (CPS) and the School of Nursing (SON), and other key administrative position searches are also underway.

The President reported that he attended the first in a series of [Citizen by CNN](#) events last week; the series was developed by Dean Wahlbeck and the School of Media & Public Affairs (SMPA). The first event consisted of a panel moderated by CNN's John King that discussed the State of the Union address, the Russian invasion of Ukraine, and other politically important events.

The university's celebration of Black History Month, including Black Heritage Celebration activities, concluded early this week, and GW now turns its attention to Women's History Month celebrations.

The President highlighted women's athletics at GW, noting that the GW women's basketball team has won its first two games in the A-10 tournament and is playing its third game at this moment and that recent gymnastics meets are showcasing GW's excellent talent in this area.

President Wrighton noted that he has been holding many meetings across campus: with faculty in the schools, with staff in enrollment and student success, and with student leadership. Tonight, he and his wife plan to attend shabbat at the GW Hillel. He also participated in the Shared Governance Task Force retreat last weekend, adding that the Provost will report on this further in his remarks today.

The President referenced two university-wide messages sent in recent days: one regarding the [Russian invasion of Ukraine](#), and one on [Women's History Month](#). President Wrighton relayed that, as he wrote in an email with an individual responding to this latter message, that he has four young granddaughters and hopes that their future and that of all women will be bright and full of opportunity.

In addition, a message went out from the Provost on GW's cost of attendance. The President acknowledged that GW's sticker price is very high. Noting that he met with a group of parents last night, he relayed that the question of whether GW's cost is simply too high was raised during the Q&A portion of the evening. GW does face financial challenges and is engaging in a comprehensive undertaking now to evaluate what it will do in 2023. There is the hope that the pandemic will recede in terms of importance, and, he noted, GW must continue to recruit very strong students. GW is very tuition dependent, and he indicated that he did not want to raise the spectre that GW would be able to do a lot more that would incur additional financial deployment. He closed by noting that GW's students have high expectations of the university, expressing his hope that everyone will pull together to create the best student experience possible for GW's students and the families who support them.

INTRODUCTION: Parliamentary Guidance and History Regarding Resolutions 22/6 and 22/7 (Sarah Binder, Parliamentarian; Murli Gupta, Co-Chair, Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies Committee; Natalie Houghtby-Haddon, Co-Chair, Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee; and Kim Roddis, Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee)

The Parliamentarian noted that the Senate faces an unusual procedural situation today and explained the situation and what the procedural options are for this situation. The Senate has two complementary but also competing resolutions on the same subject: constructing the next Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC). She clarified that this is not about the construction of the current FCC, which has already been established, been confirmed by the Assembly, and has begun its work. These resolutions refer to the FCC that would be seated for the subsequent presidential search—in other words, President Wrighton's successor's successor. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) jointly charged the Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies (ASPP) and Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) committees to work on this. Following a joint subcommittee's work, the two committees did not reach consensus on a single resolution; each committee therefore followed its charge and reported a resolution. The Senate bylaws do not give FSEC the authority to choose between the two resolutions; both are therefore on today's agenda.

The Parliamentarian described (without endorsement) the two procedural options available to the Senate as it determines how to proceed today:

- 1) A motion to consider Resolution 22/6, which would be followed by debate, possible amendment (which could include ingredients from Resolution 22/7 as amendments to Resolution 22/6, thereby addressing the substance of both resolutions), and a vote. Passage of Resolution 22/6 under this path would essentially render Resolution 22/7 moot, and the sponsor of Resolution 22/7 could request permission to withdraw the resolution or to postpone it indefinitely.
- 2) Once Resolution 22/6 is moved to debate, a Senate member could move to postpone it indefinitely (or a sponsor could move to withdraw it). If this motion passes, the expectation would be that Resolution 22/7 would follow the same step. This would return the issue to FSEC and the committees for an assessment of how best to proceed.

Professor Gupta reported that ASPP tasked by FSEC to draft more permanent guidelines for the creation of future FCCs. Prior to this point, a number of special resolutions were enacted to constitute previous (and the current) FCCs, and FSEC wanted more permanent language on this in the FOP to avoid the need for these disparate resolutions going forward. The joint subcommittee drafted its resolution; this was submitted to both ASPP and PEAFF. ASPP endorsed the joint subcommittee's resolution and submitted it to FSEC in December 2021 (22/6). However, PEAFF did not agree to this resolution, modifying it (22/7). The ASPP membership continues to believe that one member from each school is the best option, while PEAFF prefers proportional representation (both resolutions include mechanisms for additional diversity representation). Professor Gupta noted that both committees rejected the compromise solution developed by the ASPP and PEAFF co-chairs (at the request of FSEC), resulting in two resolutions before the Senate today.

Professor Houghtby-Haddon reported that the PEAFF resolution was later to the table than the ASPP resolution because there was significant discussion in PEAFF around the idea of more proportionality in the base group of FCC members in order to more broadly represent the various academic disciplines in the colleges. This would then allow "diversity membership" to be focused on other kinds of diversity beyond that of academic discipline. She added that joint conversations between members of both committees were held during this process to share reactions to both versions of the resolution and to the compromise resolution developed by Professors Gupta and Gutman. Professor Gutman requested clarification on whether PEAFF approved of the compromise proposal. Professor Houghtby-Haddon responded that, while there was support expressed in PEAFF for the compromise proposal, PEAFF ultimately narrowly voted to sustain its initial version.

Professor Roddis thanked both ASPP and PEAFF—who have largely reconciled the resolutions—for their commendable work. She noted that, however the Senate decides to act today, this work lays the groundwork for fixing a problem in the FOP that has existed for some time, namely, that the FCC has been constituted on a case-by-case basis with new resolutions each time. She reminded the group of the FCC's role: the FCC has no direct ability to conduct the presidential search (the Presidential Search Committee (PSC) is constituted by the Board of Trustees). The current FCC comprises 17 very able members who are already hard at work on the committee's charge. One of the charge items is to recommend faculty for the Board to consider appointing to the PSC; the Board may include all, some, or none of those recommendations on the PSC. She noted that the last PSC included six faculty members and expressed her personal view that this represents a remarkable commitment by the Board around valuing faculty input on presidential search. The FCC's recommendations represent an "advice" element of shared governance, not something that is under

the faculty's control; the Board will do what it deems best with the FCC's suggestions. The FCC also believes that faculty input into the position profile is very important and is currently at work on a document that can be presented to the Board in an orderly way. Again, this input represents advice and consultation, not control over the position profile content.

Professor Roddis noted that the current 17-member FCC has a very good span of representation. The system that arrived at this FCC is adequate but very clunky. Whatever happens today, she pointed out that this is not the high-stakes argument that would be taking place if today's discussion were about the constitution of the PSC as opposed to the FCC. She affirmed that the FCC may nominate beyond its roster for PSC representation. Finally, she noted, it may be helpful to experience the lessons learned from this FCC cycle before finalizing modifications to the FOP for future FCCs.

Professor Johnson suggested that the Senate recommend that the FCC simply give the Board the full FCC list and any other suggestions from other committees for consideration for PSC membership. Professor Roddis responded that recommendations the FCC makes for PSC membership is not part of Senate business but is rather one part of the FCC's charge. The current FCC may indeed submit its full roster as possible PSC candidates, but it may not. However, this is not what today's resolutions are discussing, which are instead about the constitution of the FCC for future presidential searches; this will not come into play for years.

Professor Wirtz noted that the Senate today faces a situation where there is almost universal agreement on this matter between the two committees. The representation issue is the issue differentiating the two resolutions (with ASPP in favor of unit representation and PEAFF in favor of proportional representation). He added that this resolution will have no impact for quite some time—possibly as long as a decade—but that he did not want to shut off a discussion of the deeper issue of representation. These resolutions will have long-term impact, and there may well be changes in the number of schools at GW before this takes effect. He agreed with Professor Roddis that the Senate would benefit from learning from the current FCC's experience before it discusses how to codify future FCC composition. He asked to be added to the end of the upcoming queue—so as not to limit discussion of the issue—at which point he intended to move to indefinitely postpone both resolutions and ask that the Senate form a special committee to study this issue in order to capture more perspectives.

RESOLUTION 22/6: To Implement a Faculty Consultative Committee in Presidential Searches (ASPP Version) (Murli Gupta, Co-Chair, Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies Committee)

Professor Gupta moved the consideration of Resolution 22/6; the motion was seconded. Professor Gupta noted that this resolution asks for one elected member from each of GW's 10 schools and an additional eight appointed members.

Professor Cohen-Cole raised a procedural question, asking what the proper procedure would be if the members of the Senate wish to follow Professor Wirtz's recommendation. The Parliamentarian responded that any Senator may offer a motion to postpone indefinitely, which has the effect of removing the resolution from the balance of the current Senate session. This would be decided by a majority vote and may be debated but not amended. Professor Cohen-Cole asked whether a motion to postpone indefinitely should be offered sequentially or simultaneously to cover both resolutions

at once. The Parliamentarian responded that, technically, the motions would need to be offered sequentially as Resolution 22/7 is not yet formally on the floor (the current business of the Senate is Resolution 22/6). She added that the resolution's sponsor could withdraw the resolution, or the same motion could be offered once the second resolution is on the floor.

Professor Johnson moved to indefinitely postpone Resolution 22/6; the motion was seconded.

Professor Galston thanked the members of ASPP and PEAFF for their very hard work and thought on this topic. She disagreed with the idea that this issue won't be relevant for a decade, as no one can predict the future. She noted her opposition to indefinitely postponing the matter in the interest of putting something on the books that is an improvement on the current process but could be amended later if need be.

Professor Griesshammer expressed his support for the motion to postpone. He noted that the issue will certainly have little consequence for the next year or two, given that the upcoming presidential search is not yet underway. The Senate has more than a year to revisit this, and this could be part of a bigger discussion about school representation at GW. He added that it would be optimal to implement any lessons learned from the current FCC and presidential search. He noted that what he thought had been a compromise draft was ultimately not viewed as a compromise by some but highlighted fundamental issues around representation that would be best addressed in a broader discussion beyond the Senate. Stating that this is neither the time nor the place, he hoped that both formal and informal discussions on the broader issues around this question might take place over the coming months.

Professor Gutman spoke in opposition to the motion to postpone this matter. He noted that literally hundreds of hours have been devoted to this issue, which is ultimately a matter of vanishing insignificance. He expressed that the choice before the Senate is to make a decision and move on or to offer its successors the chance to spend yet more time on this. He added that doing all this work in committee only to have it returned by the Senate is not a good way to entice faculty into committee service.

Professor Gupta echoed Professor Gutman's comments and stated his opposition to the motion to postpone. He noted that there is good language in these resolutions around amending the FOP. The only issue under dispute is around representation, and he suggested that the Senate discuss this particular issue and arrive at a decision by a vote.

Professor Zeman thanked ASPP and PEAFF for all of their hard work on this challenging issue, which certainly merits debate. He noted that he helped draft the compromise resolution and that this was based on historical actions around the FCC; the compromise discussions therefore did not include an extended debate over representation. He noted that, while he would oppose postponement, he agreed with Professor Wirtz's comments about not stifling discussion. With schools and faculty numbers changing, it is impossible to know now what concrete changes are coming. He expressed his preference for a unit-based approach now, leaving open the possibility of amendments in the future.

Professor Marotta-Walters expressed her appreciation for all the work that went into these resolutions but ultimately agreed with those moving for postponement. She stated that her support for the motion is not on the basis of kicking the can down the road but rather because of the larger

issue of considering how the FOP spells out representation for all of GW's schools. Amending the FOP on the FCC issue, she stated, would be tweaking something on a small scale that needs to be addressed on a large scale, as GW has grown beyond the parameters outlined in the current FOP. There needs to be a systematic examination of what representation means at GW, including how to treat CPS, which currently has no representation anywhere. She recommended keeping an archive of this work, which can later be taken together with lessons learned from the current presidential search and PEAFF's current study of the FOP.

Professor Cordes noted that he was initially prepared to support the compromise amendment for both resolutions, adding that this is an important question that merits Senate discussion. He noted, however, that he has since come around to the idea that representation by discipline or field cannot be achieved through unit representation; for example, the Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (CCAS) combines three fields of study under one unit. He stated that he would not want to see this postponement be truly indefinite but would support this issue coming back for Senate study in its next session.

Professor Yezer echoed Professor Marotta-Walters's comments, adding that there is a more fundamental issue of representation in that the Senate doesn't truly represent the full faculty, as some schools and fields are underrepresented or not represented at all under the current model (including the unit generating the largest revenue surplus for the university).

The Parliamentarian reminded the group that debate should be confined to the current motion.

A vote on the motion to indefinitely postpone the resolution passed 23-8.

RESOLUTION 22/7: To Implement a Faculty Consultative Committee in Presidential Searches (PEAFF Version) (Natalie Houghtby-Haddon, Co-Chair, Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee)

Professor Gutman moved the consideration of Resolution 22/7; the motion was seconded. Professor Houghtby-Haddon noted that Professor Gutman had already expressed the committee's concerns. She added the PEAFF chairs felt it was important that PEAFF's clear support for proportional representation come before the Senate.

Professor Agnew asked whether the resolution might be postponed not indefinitely but to a fixed point in the future. The Parliamentarian responded that, conceptually, the matter can be postponed to a particular date. She noted that the annual FSEC turnover comes up next month and that it might make the most sense to indefinitely postpone, sending this back to FSEC to discuss refining the charge in order to avoid bringing two resolutions forward in the future. Professor Agnew asked whether "indefinite" means never; the Parliamentarian responded that this can be recrafted and reintroduced as a new resolution.

Professor Clarke noted that he voted against postponement for Resolution 22/6, but, in the interest of moving along, moved to indefinitely postpone Resolution 22/7; the motion was seconded.

Professor Griesshammer expressed his surprise that Resolution 22/7 was moved for consideration following the vote to indefinitely postpone Resolution 22/6. Given the similarities between the two resolutions, he noted, it would be common courtesy to postpone both resolutions.

Professor Gutman noted that he intended no discourtesy in moving the current resolution. As a co-chair of PEAf, he noted, he saw it as his duty to abide by FSEC's charge and to present this resolution to the Senate. He added that he still opposed postponement for reasons he described earlier.

A vote on the motion to indefinitely postpone the resolution passed 26-1.

President Wrighton thanked the group for this healthy discussion and hoped that the Senate would indeed consider the question of how best to represent the faculty in the future. He noted that, in the context of the SGTF, the Board would appreciate clarity on faculty representation as well.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No new resolutions were introduced at the meeting.

GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Nominations for membership to Senate standing Committees
The following nominations for committee membership were approved by unanimous consent:
 - ASPP: Amita Vyas/GWSPH
 - Physical Facilities: Jim Tielsch/GWSPH

- II. Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Arthur Wilson, Chair
Professor Wilson's FSEC report is [attached](#).

- III. Provost's Remarks
The Provost's remarks are [attached](#).

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Professor Johnson noted that he has encountered situations teaching undergraduates in the medical school in which he has wanted to award a grade beyond an A for particularly deserving students and asked what mechanisms would be required to accomplish this. Provost Bracey responded that one immediate mechanism would be for Professor Johnson to raise the issue with the Senate's Educational Policy & Technology (EPT) committee to determine whether there is an appetite within the Senate to undertake what would be a large-scale endeavor toward changing the university's grading policy. Beyond this, he noted, operationalization efforts would need to involve the deans and the Registrar, among others. Ms. Chaojareon confirmed she would put Professor Johnson in touch with EPT leadership.

Professor Roddis expressed some concerns about the SGTF's process. She asked about a particular section of the FOP:

Article III. The Faculty Senate

Section 1. Functions

The Faculty Senate, on behalf of the Faculty, shall, with respect to matters that are of concern to more than one college, school, or division, or to the Faculty:

- 1) Formulate principles and objectives and find facts, so as to recommend policies to the President;
 - 2) Provide the President and the Board of Trustees with advice and counsel on such matters as they may request;
- &c.

She noted that, while this section doesn't directly say that the Senate represents the faculty, it does state that the Senate does several things "on behalf of the faculty...with respect to matters that are of concern to more than one college, school, or division, or to the Faculty." She asked, whether, when the Provost says the SGTF will examine GW's governing documents, this means that the Board is planning on making a change to how the Senate—on behalf of the faculty—shall do the matters in accordance with this FOP section. Provost Bracey responded that this is a fairly specific question and that he cannot answer that in the moment. He noted that he does not know what the Board is considering, or even if the Board is aware of this particular section of the FOP. He confirmed that the Board convened this task force to address concerns around shared governance. The task force's charge is to make recommendations to the Board, and it has not yet begun deep discussions about the kinds of recommendations it would like to make. The three themes identified in today's reports from Chair Wilson and the Provost will be the focal point of conversations going forward, but the task force is still far from making recommendations. The SGTF will review key governance documents (e.g., the FOP, the Faculty Code) to inform their conversations about recommendations. Once the recommendations have been made, the Board can accept or reject them as it sees fit.

Professor Roddis clarified her question, noting that the survey included a number of questions about who represents the faculty. It is one thing to say that the task force will examine the governing documents, and she noted that the SGTF has refused to allow FSEC to see the information provided to the task force on governing documents. She asked whether there is any indication that there will be some fundamental change in the basis of shared governance at GW as opposed to an attempt to facilitate implementation built upon current governance structures. Provost Bracey responded that there has been no indication he is aware of that there will be a fundamental alteration in what he and the Senate understand to be the basis of shared governance as articulated in GW's existing documents. In fact, one of the items on the task force's to-do list is to provide greater clarity around GW's existing institutional structures, how they operate, and the roles and responsibilities of individuals within the structures as currently defined. Therefore, one of the larger tasks before the SGTF will be to provide clarity around existing structures, not substituting some alternative arrangement designed to subvert those structures.

Professor Tielsch referenced the current FY23 budget discussions the administration is holding with the deans and the fact that the deans are being asked for proposals for innovative, new initiatives. He asked whether decisions about these proposals will be shared with the Senate so that the Senate

might understand exactly which initiatives that might be cross-school/interdisciplinary might be approved for implementation in the next fiscal year. Provost Bracey responded that there are two types of academic planning meetings going on: those tied to the FY23 budget (the annual spring planning meetings with 5-year-planning that has taken place at GW for many years) and those asking the deans to identify university-wide initiatives. These initiatives could combine the efforts of more than one school and be of significant enough planning significance that they should be built into a larger planning exercise that may involve, for example, capital planning. This is part of a larger planning exercise, and he invited President Wrighton to speak on this as well as this is an exercise the President and Provost are undertaking together as part of one of the President's work items, namely, to prepare the university for the next presidential search.

President Wrighton added that he is working with the school deans to understand where there will be opportunities to collaborate across schools and where deans will have the opportunity to bring forward new initiatives, especially those that would in essence be university-level activities involving more than one school. He indicated that the administration would draw in faculty input and hoped to be able to set out its academic priorities in the next couple of months. As he has noted previously, this is not a comprehensive plan. A comprehensive planning effort will need to assess costs (e.g., human and financial resources needed, space requirements) of the identified academic priorities, and he noted there is a long way to go before the university gets to a comprehensive planning process involving a large group of people (and ultimately the Board). He expressed his confidence that he and the Provost would want to brief the Senate before moving on to comprehensive planning that would need to be done to prepare for the next president.

Professor Wirtz noted that, as a member of the IT subcommittee, he finds himself under increased pressure from faculty colleagues about GW's a/v infrastructure problems. Recognizing that the Provost is well aware of these issues, he noted that it would be helpful to all involved if the Provost could provide a summary of where the university stands with regard to solving GW's numerous a/v problems emergently. Provost Bracey responded that Jared Johnson has requested several classroom service delivery positions be filled. While he knows that the positions have been approved, he noted that he could not speak to how the assessment of needs is being made or how resources are being allocated (as the IT department does not report to the Provost). He added that steps are being taken to address this important issue, which goes beyond staffing concerns to issues of classroom equipment aging out of useful life. Professor Wirtz noted that GW's students are very badly served by the current situation. He was glad to hear that hiring is apparently underway but noted that this is a long-term issue; GW currently has a short-term calamity that is resulting in incredible anger among the faculty. He asked that the Provost please convey to those in charge that resolving these short-term issues is absolutely critical. Provost Bracey affirmed the importance of faculty being provided with the resources they need to maintain a high-quality educational environment. He noted that Professor Wirtz's message has been received loud and clear and will be conveyed; he agreed that the university needs a much more robust response to correct these issues in the short-term.

Professor Griesshammer asked whether updates on international travel requirements will be forthcoming soon, noting that faculty will need to make travel arrangements soon for summer research travel. He noted that current policies require a level of preparation for international travel that no longer seems warranted for many destinations (e.g., Europe). Provost Bracey responded that the updates made at the beginning of the fall semester have not been re-reviewed, but he indicated he would look into this, communicating any updates as quickly as possible.

Professor Yezer expressed his delight with the idea of a university planning exercise that determines where GW wants to be in five to ten years and then works backward to figure out how to get there. He hoped that these plans would be run past faculty committees for input. He asked what the cost benefits are of the university's current COVID policies. Specifically, with so many asymptomatic cases, are GW's expensive policies (e.g., course capture for students missing class) providing a corresponding benefit? Professor Parsons also observed the degradation of the classroom environment as a result of long-term mask usage.

The Provost acknowledged the challenges inherent in determining the best balance and noted that the university continues to rely on its medical advisory group and public health expertise in determining its COVID policies. This expertise will also allow the university to make sound decisions about when some of the current constraints can be relaxed. President Wrighton added that GW's policies are guided by public health and medicine experts; the university's primary responsibility is to ensure that the campus community is as safe as possible. This does not mean that GW will spend every penny it has on mitigation measures but rather that it will do the best it can with the advice it receives. He referenced GW's campus testing protocol, which requires biweekly testing—other institutions have been doing twice-weekly testing for their populations, but GW was guided to understand that this frequency of testing was not valuable for the GW population; this saves significant resources in terms of testing costs. Some universities are dropping their surveillance testing programs entirely, and GW will need to consider at what point this is a sound decision. The university was guided to its decision to continue indoor mask requirements even while the District has, in some instances, relaxed its requirements. GW's positivity rate is falling but is still above what it was for most of the fall semester (prior to Omicron); caution is still warranted, particularly given the concern around Omicron's second variant leading to an uncomfortably persistent tail of cases. The President added that, while many cases are asymptomatic, there are still people within the university community who are more vulnerable; spreading this virus can be catastrophic for them.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:04pm.



**A RESOLUTION TO IMPLEMENT A FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE IN
PRESIDENTIAL SEARCHES (22/6)**

WHEREAS, Section C, subsection 5, of “Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code” states, without further guidance:

“The Faculty Assembly shall elect a committee to advise and consult with the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof in the selection of a President”; and

WHEREAS, in 1986, the Faculty Assembly adopted “A Resolution to Implement Part C.5 of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code*” (FA 86/1), which established procedures for faculty participation in presidential searches and directed each of the Schools then in existence to elect a member-designate for confirmation by the Faculty Assembly to serve on the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC); and

WHEREAS, modifications to the selection procedures intended to broaden diversity and enhance representativeness have been adopted for the 2017 (FA 17/2) and 2022 (FS 22/2) presidential searches; and

WHEREAS, these resolutions required the Senate to elect additional members to the FCC so that the FCC and Presidential Search Committee include adequate participation among disciplines and faculty rank; and

WHEREAS, making such modifications permanent for all future presidential searches underscores the Faculty Senate’s unqualified commitment to fundamental principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion;

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

{1) Article IV of the Faculty Organization Plan should be amended by striking and replacing Article IV with the following:

“Article IV. The Faculty Consultative Committee

SECTION 1. CREATION OF THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Faculty Senate shall send to the Faculty Assembly for endorsement an elected Faculty Consultative Committee to advise and consult with the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof in the selection of a President:

{1) No later than four weeks after the announcement of a presidential vacancy, or as

soon thereafter as is possible, the Faculty Senate representatives of the nine academic divisions represented on the Senate (to wit: Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, Elliott School of International Affairs, School of Medical and Health Sciences, School of Business, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Law School, Milken Institute School of Public Health, School of Nursing, School of Engineering and Applied Sciences), and a committee of the whole of the College of Professional Studies faculty, shall caucus to nominate to their respective faculties two or more members of those faculties;

- {2) The several faculties shall meet no later than six weeks after the announcement of a presidential vacancy, or as soon thereafter as is possible, to elect one member-designate to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) from the slate submitted by their Senate representatives or by nomination and election from the floor;
- {3) The several faculties shall immediately submit the names of persons thus elected to the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC);
- {4) In order to provide broader faculty representation of those with otherwise underrepresented traits or characteristics (including academic discipline, rank, and track) in a timely manner, the FSEC shall select up to eight additional candidates, including one member of the FSEC;
- {5) The FSEC Chair shall present the resulting slate of nominees to the Faculty Senate for its confirmation and approval;
- {6) The proposed FCC shall be submitted to the Faculty Assembly for election at a Special Meeting to be called as soon as feasibly possible after confirmation and approval by the Faculty Senate, upon which the confirmed and approved slate of nominees shall be declared elected to serve as members of the FCC;
- {7) Within 3 weeks of the confirmation and approval by the Faculty Assembly, the FCC shall convene upon the initiative of the FSEC Chairman, elect a chair, and provide for record-keeping;

SECTION 2. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ROLE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCESS

- (1) The FCC shall request the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof to accept some or all of its members to serve on the Presidential Search Committee for the duration of the presidential search. In the event that not all members of the FCC are so accepted, the FCC shall elect from among its members that number designated by the Board to serve on the Search Committee; but the FCC shall retain a separate order of business and confer regularly with those of its members who become active members of the Search Committee;
- (2) The FCC shall request of the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof that, whether some or all of its members are accepted as full members of the Search Committee:

- a. The FCC be accorded an active role in defining the criteria which the Search Committee will apply in its consideration of the applicants; and
 - b. The Search Committee give full and judicious consideration to any well-reasoned views which the FCC may express with respect to particular applicants;
 - c. Within constraints imposed by the need for confidentiality, as defined by the Search Committee, the FCC may, at its discretion, make interim reports to the Faculty Senate;
 - d. The duly constituted FCC will be disbanded upon the appointment of a new president.”;
- (2) Section C.5 of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code should be deleted; and
- (3) Article IV of the Faculty Organization Plan should be renumbered Article V.

Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee
December 28, 2021 (modified January 28, 2022)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 22/6 (A RESOLUTION TO IMPLEMENT A FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE IN PRESIDENTIAL SEARCHES)

We request this amendment to be distributed with the Senate agenda and corresponding resolution(s).

Add a resolving clause to be numbered 3 after present resolving clause 2 of the ASPP version (22/6):

*The number of elected member-designates from each faculty shall be equal to **one-fourth** of the number of the faculty's representation in the Faculty Senate, rounded to the next highest number, and shall include one member-designate from the College of Professional Studies.*

The bold-faced text marks the difference to the PEAFF version (22/7), which uses “**one-third**”. The ASPP version (22/6) has one elected member-designates per school, plus one from CPS.

Modify resolving clause 5 of the ASPP version (22/6):

*In order to provide broader faculty representation of those with otherwise underrepresented demographic traits or characteristics and with diverse academic disciplines, ranks, and tracks in a timely manner, the FSEC shall select up to **six** additional candidates. **At least one the FCC members shall be a member of the FSEC.***

The bold-faced text marks differences to the PEAFF version (22/7), which uses “**eight** additional candidates, **including one member of the FSEC.**” The ASPP version (22/6) adds up to 8 additional candidates, and leaves out the FSEC member provision.

Rationale:

We propose the amendment as a compromise between the ASPP (22/6) and PEAFF (22/7) versions.

Rationale in RC3: The proposed amendment makes for an agile FCC, which at the same time provides adequate chances for representation along a host of diversity axes, including different academic experiences. It adds up to 6 members from a pool of diversity candidates for a total of up to 20 members. The 14 “school-designate” members are distributed as follows (compared to proposals):

	<i>this proposal</i>	PEAFF proposal	ASPP proposal
CCAS:	3	4	1
SB, SMHS:	2 each	2 each, also for Law, SEAS	1 each
all other schools, incl. CPS:	1 each	1 each	1 each
total	14(+6=20)	17(+8=25)	10(+8=18)

Rationale in RC5: The change keeps the FCC size under control, accounting for the fact that the diversity of experiences is also at least in part addressed by having more school-elected members.

The PEAFF and ASPP clauses would assign one of the up to 8 additional seats to an FSEC member, while the proposed amendment just ensures that there be one FSEC member on the FCC. That can be achieved by election on the school level (as it did this time), or by adding a candidate via the additional members. The proposed version of this amendment provides more flexibility.

Harald Griebhammer, 22 February 2022

Seconded by Senators: Joe Cordes, Eric Grynawski, Alexa Alice Joubin, Sarah Wagner, Katrin Schultheiss, & Jamie Cohen-Cole

Seconded by Senators-Elect: Guillermo Orti, Barbara von Barghahn, & Heather Bamford



**A RESOLUTION TO IMPLEMENT A FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE IN
PRESIDENTIAL SEARCHES (22/7)**

WHEREAS, Section C, subsection 5, of “Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code” states, without further guidance:

“The Faculty Assembly shall elect a committee to advise and consult with the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof in the selection of a President”; and

WHEREAS, In 1986, the Faculty Assembly adopted “A Resolution to Implement Part C.5 of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code*” (FA 86/1), which established procedures for faculty participation in presidential searches and directed each of the Schools then in existence to elect a member-designate for confirmation by the Faculty Assembly to serve on the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC); and

WHEREAS, Modifications to the selection procedures intended to broaden diversity and enhance representativeness have been adopted for the 2017 (FA 17/2) and 2022 (FS 22/2) presidential searches; and

WHEREAS, These resolutions required the Senate to elect additional members to the FCC so that the FCC and Presidential Search Committee include adequate participation among disciplines and faculty rank; and

WHEREAS, Making such modifications permanent for all future presidential searches underscores the Faculty Senate’s unqualified commitment to fundamental principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion,

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

1. Article IV of the Faculty Organization Plan should be amended by striking and replacing Article IV with the following:

“Article IV. The Faculty Consultative Committee

SECTION 1. CREATION OF THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Faculty Senate shall send to the Faculty Assembly for endorsement an elected Faculty Consultative Committee to advise and consult with the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof in the selection of a President:

{1) No later than four weeks after the announcement of a presidential vacancy, or as

soon thereafter as is possible, the Faculty Senate representatives of the nine academic divisions represented on the Senate (to wit: Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, Elliott School of International Affairs, School of Medical and Health Sciences, School of Business, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Law School, Milken Institute School of Public Health, School of Nursing, School of Engineering and Applied Sciences), and a committee of the whole of the College of Professional Studies faculty, shall caucus to nominate to their respective faculties members of those faculties;

- {2) The several faculties shall meet no later than six weeks after the announcement of a presidential vacancy, or as soon thereafter as is possible, to elect member-designate(s) to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) from the slate submitted by their Senate representatives or by nomination and election from the floor;
- {3) The number of elected member-designates from each faculty shall be equal to one-third of the number of that faculty's representation in the Faculty Senate, rounded to the next highest number, and shall include one member-designate from the College of Professional Studies;
- {4) The several faculties shall immediately submit the names of persons thus elected to the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC);
- {5) In order to provide broader faculty representation of those with otherwise underrepresented demographic traits or characteristics and with diverse academic disciplines, ranks, and tracks in a timely manner, the FSEC shall select up to eight additional candidates, including one member of the FSEC;
- {6) The FSEC Chair shall present the resulting slate of nominees to the Faculty Senate for its confirmation and approval;
- {7) The proposed FCC shall be submitted to the Faculty Assembly for election at a Special Meeting to be called as soon as feasibly possible after confirmation and approval by the Faculty Senate, upon which the confirmed and approved slate of nominees shall be declared elected to serve as members of the FCC;
- {8) Within 3 weeks of the confirmation and approval by the Faculty Assembly, the FCC shall convene upon the initiative of the FSEC Chairman, elect a chair, and provide for record-keeping;

SECTION 2. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ROLE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCESS

- (1) The FCC shall request the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof to accept some or all of its members to serve on the Presidential Search Committee for the duration of the presidential search. In the event that not all members of the FCC are so accepted, the FCC shall, in keeping with the principles set forth in Section 1(5) above, elect from among its members that number designated by the Board to serve on the Search Committee; but the FCC shall retain a separate

order of business and confer regularly with those of its members who become active members of the Search Committee;

- (2) The FCC shall request of the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof that, whether some or all of its members are accepted as full members of the Search Committee:
 - a. The FCC be accorded an active role in defining the criteria which the Search Committee will apply in its consideration of the applicants; and
 - b. The Search Committee give full and judicious consideration to any well-reasoned views which the FCC may express with respect to particular applicants;
 - c. Within constraints imposed by the need for confidentiality, as defined by the Search Committee, the FCC may, at its discretion, make interim reports to the Faculty Senate;
 - d. The duly constituted FCC will be disbanded upon the appointment of a new president.”
2. Section C.5 of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code should be deleted.
3. Article IV of the Faculty Organization Plan should be renumbered Article V.

Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee
January 24, 2022



Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)
March 4, 2022
Arthur Wilson, Chair

Standing Senate Committee Updates

The [annual call for committee service volunteers](#) will remain open through the end of March. All faculty are encouraged to review the committee descriptions linked in the call and to consider volunteering for committee service. Any questions about the online form may be directed to Liz Carlson or Jenna Chaojareon.

Shared Governance

First and foremost, we want to thank all the faculty members who participated in the survey and provided qualitative comments. Your input has helped lay a solid groundwork for the faculty's voice in the current process of shared governance.

The shared governance task force held a retreat on February 26; President Wrighton joined the group for this key meeting. Cheryl Beil presented the preliminary results of the survey. After that, the task force engaged in a good discussion of the results that led us to identify three major themes:

- The importance of timely, transparent communication among the faculty-board-administration, both in formal decision-making and in informal interactions;
- Institutionalizing shared governance by developing formal and informal structures; and
- The importance of achieving and maintaining a culture of trust, respect, generosity of spirit, and collaboration.

We have asked the administration to share the results of the survey with the entire faculty. We hope this will be done soon. Meanwhile, the task force is working on shared governance principles and clarification of roles and responsibilities of the faculty, administration, and the trustees.

Thus far, we have made good progress, but there is still much work to be done. We will continue to share updates with the senate through appropriate mechanisms. The [shared governance task force website](#) continues to be available as an avenue for information and input.

Personnel Actions

There are no active grievances at the university.

Calendar

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is March 25, 2022. Draft resolutions and any other possible Senate agenda items should be forwarded to Liz Carlson in the Senate office with as much advance notice as possible to assist with the timely compilation of the FSEC meeting agenda, ideally by March 18, 2022.



Faculty Senate
Provost Bracey Remarks
March 4, 2022

Spring Academic Planning

The spring academic planning meetings to review FY23 budget plans and academic priorities with schools and Provost's Office units are underway. President Wrighton and I met with the deans in February to establish academic priorities that would help inform the FY23 budget. I have met with a number of units over the past couple of weeks, and these meetings will continue in March.

Shared Governance Task Force

As Chair Wilson stated, I would like to thank the faculty and administrators who participated in the shared governance survey. The virtual retreat with the Task Force this past Saturday was fruitful and illuminating. We are in the process of validating the major survey findings, and we will notify faculty, administration and trustees when they are available on the Task Force website. In considering the survey's findings, the Task Force concluded that there are a number of areas of agreement among the faculty, Board of Trustees, and administration, and identified several major themes:

- The importance of timely, transparent communication among the three shared governance bodies, both in formal decision-making and in informal interactions;
- The need for clarity regarding how formal and informal institutional structures operate, and how roles and responsibilities within these structures are defined (this represents a slight correction to the second point articulated in Chair Wilson's report); and
- The importance of achieving and maintaining a culture of trust, respect, generosity of spirit, and collaboration.

Next, the Task Force will begin to develop a shared governance statement of principles, review key governance documents, and develop communications recommendations. The Task Force will continue to meet throughout March and early April, with the goal of submitting its report to the Board of Trustees by April 15.

The virtual town halls, the survey, and the robust discussion at the virtual retreat have demonstrated that the community is eager to work together to arrive at a consensus around the meaning and expectations of shared governance so that the university can continue to strive for excellence in its third century. I am grateful to my task force colleagues and my colleagues across the university for their engagement in this process.

Diversity Program Review Team

Over the past couple of weeks, the Diversity Program Review Team has been meeting with key university partners who have begun sharing data and information about the DEI experiences of students, faculty, and staff in various areas of the university. Some of the individuals presenting to

the team include senior associate provost for academic planning and assessment Cheryl Beil, vice provost for enrollment and student success Jay Goff, interim vice president and chief people officer Sabrina Minor, and myself on the topic of Faculty Affairs.

The team's sub-groups are studying relevant data and will meet next week to strategize their work ahead.

The team is working on finalizing each Advisory Council and will meet with representatives over the coming weeks to begin gathering their feedback on DEI issues.

Commencement Save the Date

Hopefully you saw the recent Commencement Save the Date that went out to the community. Commencement will be held on Sunday, May 15 down at the National Mall, on the same site it was held for the October ceremony, adjacent to the Smithsonian Castle. Our Events team is hard at work preparing an exciting Commencement Week of school celebrations and more, which will include a Welcome Center like we had for our Bicentennial celebration in October.

The first round of our student speaker competition closed on Wednesday, and we had approximately 80 applicants. Schools and colleges will review the applications and choose top candidates to move into the next round of the competition.

Please stay tuned for more information and ways to be involved.

Adapting Course Materials for Equity Faculty Grant

Several weeks ago, I shared that Libraries & Academic Innovation is requesting applications for its new Adapting Course Materials for Equity Faculty Grant.

As you know, course material costs can be a significant barrier to student success. The Adapting Course Materials for Equity Faculty Grant program seeks to provide both financial and pedagogical support to faculty who redesign or develop courses using open or zero-cost course materials. It also seeks to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion by prioritizing applications that increase culturally inclusive course content and diverse perspectives.

This program will award grants between the amounts of \$250 to \$1000 to faculty who want to adopt and adapt open or zero-cost course materials in undergraduate courses taught between Fall 2022 and Fall 2023. Applications are due by Friday, March 11 at 11:59pm, so please apply on the Library website.