



Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, April 8, 2022, at 2:00pm
via WebEx

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the [minutes](#) of the meeting held on March 4, 2022
3. Acknowledgment of Senate members ending terms (Mark Wrighton, President)
4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Mark Wrighton, President)
5. RESOLUTION 22/8: Of Appreciation for Professor Arthur Wilson (Professor Phil Wirtz)
6. RESOLUTION 22/9: Of Appreciation for Professor Miriam Galston (Professor Scott Kieff)
7. RESOLUTION 22/10: A Resolution on Freedom to Expend Internal Research Awards (Professor Kausik Sarkar, Co-Chair, Research Committee)
8. RESOLUTION 22/11: On Defending Academic Freedom to Teach About Race and LGBTQIA+ Gender Issues (Professor Jeff Gutman, Co-Chair, Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee)
9. RESOLUTION 22/12: To Approve Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity (Professor Sarah Wagner, Co-Chair, Educational Policy & Technology Committee, and Ms. Christy Anthony, Director, Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities)
10. RESOLUTION 22/13: On Principles of Shared Governance and Recommended Mechanisms for Strengthening Shared Governance at GW (Professor Shaista Khilji)
11. REPORT: Annual Core Indicators of Academic Excellence (Chris Bracey, Provost)
12. INTRODUCTION OF NEW RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE
13. GENERAL BUSINESS
 - a) Standing Committee annual reports received (see attached)
 - Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies
 - Honors & Academic Convocations
 - b) Election of the 2022-2023 Faculty Senate Executive Committee (see attached)
 - c) Appointment of the 2022-2023 Senate Parliamentarian (see attached)
 - d) Appointment of the Dispute Resolution Committee Chair (see attached)
 - e) Report of the Executive Committee (Professor Arthur Wilson, Chair)
 - f) Provost's Remarks
14. Brief Statements and Questions
15. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary



Faculty Senate

A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR PROFESSOR ARTHUR WILSON (22/8)

WHEREAS, Associate Professor Arthur Wilson has earned the highest level of respect, gratitude, and admiration of his colleagues on the Faculty Senate as well as the esteem and appreciation of the entire University community; and

WHEREAS, Professor Wilson's term of continuous service on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate reached its three-year limit under the Faculty Organization Plan in April 2022; and,

WHEREAS, Professor Wilson has guided the Faculty Senate during a period characterized by enormous challenges, including (among many others) the COVID-19 pandemic, leadership changes in the University Administration and the Board of Trustees, and a shift to and from an all-virtual teaching environment;

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

Professor Arthur Wilson has provided distinguished service as a member of the Faculty Senate since 2016, as a member of the Senate Executive Committee since 2019, and as Chair of the Executive Committee since 2020.

As Chair of the Executive Committee, Professor Wilson has provided outstanding leadership to the University, particularly in promoting the faculty's role in shared governance, with remarkable equanimity, skill, and above all, diplomacy.

Of particular note, Professor Wilson's integrity, patience, and perseverance led to a faculty survey through which faculty members were able to provide a comprehensive evaluation, both individually and collectively, of the University administration.

As a consequence of his extraordinary leadership, THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY HEREBY EXPRESSES ITS DEEPEST ADMIRATION, APPRECIATION AND GRATITUDE TO PROFESSOR ARTHUR J. WILSON FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED SERVICE.



Faculty Senate

A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR PROFESSOR MIRIAM GALSTON (22/9)

WHEREAS, Associate Professor Miriam Galston (hereafter “Professor Galston”) 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 Galston's term of continuous service on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate concludes in April 2022; and,

WHEREAS, As Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee since 2020, Professor Galston has displayed exemplary leadership across a particularly tumultuous period;

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

Professor Galston has provided distinguished service as Vice Chair of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and longstanding member of the Senate Committee of Fiscal Planning and Budgeting. Her level-headed approach to problem solving has promoted greater understanding across formerly disparate segments of the University community.

Professor Galston's service as Vice Chair of the Senate Executive Committee has been particularly skillful given the contemporary challenges of COVID, presidential transition, and provost transition.

Professor Galston's leadership and active participation in issues regarding (among many others) the high quality education of our students; joint governance; diversity, equity, and inclusion; and health and welfare of the University community have greatly improved the institution.

As a consequence of her skillful leadership, THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY HEREBY EXPRESSES ITS DEEPEST ADMIRATION, APPRECIATION AND GRATITUDE TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR MIRIAM GALSTON FOR HER DISTINGUISHED SERVICE.



**A RESOLUTION ON FREEDOM TO EXPEND INTERNAL RESEARCH AWARDS
(22/10)**

WHEREAS, GW allows multi-year budgeting of certain internal research funds including startup funds; and

WHEREAS, other universities including Washington University in Saint Louis have internally awarded research awards that can be budgeted over several years; and

WHEREAS, GW central finance has impeded research activities by making it more difficult to carry over funds than had been previously been the case; and

WHEREAS, in many fields research planning has a horizon of longer than 12 months; and

WHEREAS, in many fields, researchers depend almost exclusively on internal awarded research funds;

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

1. That the Office of the Vice Provost for Research (OVPR) is requested to allow applicants for internal awards including, but not limited to, University Facilitating Funds (UFF), to plan and budget for multi-year activities; and
2. That the Senate requests that the colleges be allowed by central finance to advertise and award multi-year internally supported research awards without harm to schools' year to year spending allocation.

Resolution 22/11 Background

The attached resolution aims to address a specific issue: the ways that state legislatures are targeting both universities and K-12 education in an effort to limit the teaching and/or discussion of basic fundamentals of this country's history and social conditions where those discussions intersect with issues to do with race, gender, and sexuality.¹

Such targeting has attempted to squelch the ability of teachers in K-12 and in universities to have honest examination of these issues because, the legislatures claim, such topics honestly treated are “divisive.” Often what is treated as allowed by state legislatures as “non-divisive” are curricula that deny historical facts.²

In response to this specific problem, namely the effort by legislatures to pretend that gagging teachers on the topics of race, gender, and sexuality is somehow apolitical, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and seventy academic associations have taken a stand to allow teachers the right to address these subjects honestly. (See Appendix 1)

What the AAUP, American Historical Association (AHA), and the other associated academic bodies recognize in their joint statement is that state legislatures are not attacking the freedom to teach on just any issue, but on the particular topics of race, gender, and sexuality.

This resolution thus calls for affirming and endorsing the AAUP/AHA statement as well as the spirit that motivated the statement.

¹ Among others, Andy Sher, “Tennessee Bill Puts Public Colleges at Legal Risk over Mandated ‘divisive Concepts’ for Students, Employees,” *Timesfreepress.Com*, February 15, 2022, <https://www.timesfreepress.com/news/local/story/2022/feb/15/tennessee-bill-puts-public-colleges-legal-risk/563436/>. Amendment 1 to Tennessee HB2670 and SB2290 provides, “the institution may terminate the employee's employment pursuant to the employment agreement or [§ 49-8-303](#), whichever is applicable”; “Georgia Bill Banning ‘divisive Concepts’ on Race in Schools Advances,” <https://www.onlineathens.com/story/news/2022/02/09/georgia-bill-banning-divisive-concepts-race-schools-advances/6725774001/>; “Bill against ‘divisive Concepts’ Linked to CRT in College Goes to Noem,” accessed March 7, 2022, <https://www.argusleader.com/story/news/education/2022/03/07/bill-against-divisive-concepts-linked-critical-race-theory-colleges-goes-kristi-noem-desk/9417153002/>; “Va. House Delegates Pass Ban on ‘Divisive Concepts’ from Being Taught in Schools,” WTOP News, February 16, 2022, <https://wtop.com/virginia/2022/02/va-house-delegates-pass-ban-on-divisive-concepts-from-being-taught-in-schools/>. “In His Fight against ‘Woke’ Schools, DeSantis Tears at the Seams of a Diverse Florida,” *Washington Post*, accessed March 9, 2022, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2022/02/07/desantis-anti-woke-act/>.

² “As House Candidate, DeSantis Penned Racially Charged Book Excusing Slavery,” *American Ledger*, October 8, 2018, <https://american-ledger.com/accountability/as-house-candidate-desantis-penned-racially-charged-book-excusing-slavery/>; Rebecca Klein, “The Rightwing US Textbooks That Teach Slavery as ‘Black Immigration,’” *The Guardian*, August 12, 2021, sec. Education, <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2021/aug/12/right-wing-textbooks-teach-slavery-black-immigration>.



A RESOLUTION ON DEFENDING ACADEMIC FREEDOM TO TEACH ABOUT RACE AND LGBTQIA+ GENDER ISSUES (22/11)

WHEREAS state legislative proposals are being introduced and passed across the United States to limit academic discussions of race and LGBTQIA+ issues in American history in schools, colleges and universities, often based on the belief that a candid and full discussion of them would be “divisive”;

WHEREAS our students, staff, and faculty often come from the racial and LGBTQIA+ communities addressed in these proposals;

WHEREAS the successful imposition of restrictions and limits on the teaching of these important issues may lead to similar restrictions and limits on the teaching of other significant issues;

WHEREAS GWU’s faculty affirms the importance of academic freedom to the proper functioning of universities, as described in the American Association of University Professors’ [1940 statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure](#);

WHEREAS faculty have responsibility for the curriculum at their universities;

WHEREAS the term “divisive”, which multiple state legislatures have used prevents honest treatment of the historical facts of race in the United States, is indeterminate, subjective, and chills the capacity of educators to promote the development of essential critical thinking skills;

WHEREAS educating students about systemic barriers to realizing a multiracial and multicultural democracy should be understood as central to the active and engaged pursuit of knowledge in the 21st century to produce engaged and informed students and citizens;

WHEREAS over seventy organizations, including the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), issued the [Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History](#) (June 16, 2021) stating their “firm opposition to a spate of legislative proposals being introduced across the country that target academic lessons, presentations, and discussions of racism and related issues in American history in schools, colleges and universities The clear goal of these efforts is to suppress teaching and learning about the role of racism in the history of the United States.... Educators must provide an accurate view of the past in order to better prepare students for community participation and robust civic engagement...In higher education, under principles of academic freedom that have been widely endorsed,

professors are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject. Educators, not politicians, should make decisions about teaching and learning.”;

WHEREAS in a nation that has for centuries struggled with issues of racial inequity and injustice, many students do not have adequate knowledge of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and LGBTQIA+ history and the policies that contributed to inequities; and

WHEREAS GWU is committed to diversity, equity, and inclusion and incorporating these threatened concepts in our teaching;³

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

1. That the Senate supports the faculty at universities impacted or potentially impacted by legislation or Boards of Trustees’ policies in resolutely rejecting any attempts by bodies external to the faculty to restrict or dictate university curriculum on any matter, including matters related to gender, racial and social justice, and in standing firm against encroachment on faculty authority by legislatures or the Boards of Trustees;
2. That the Senate stands with our K-12 colleagues throughout the country who may be affected by legislation that limits or restricts their ability to fully, honestly, and candidly teach about matters involving race, gender and sexual identity in age-appropriate ways in their classes;
3. That the Senate calls upon President Wrighton and Provost Bracey to affirm that they support educators across the country in rejecting any attempts by bodies external to the faculty to restrict or dictate university curriculum on any matter, including matters related to racial and social justice, and standing firm against encroachment on faculty authority by legislatures or the Boards of Trustees; and
4. That the Senate endorses and affirms the [Joint Statement on Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism](#), authored by the AAUP, PEN America, the American Historical Association, and the Association of American Colleges & Universities, endorsed by over seventy organizations, and issued on June 16, 2021.⁴

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
March 21, 2022

³ Senate resolution 21/7. <https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/blogs.gwu.edu/dist/0/196/files/2020/07/Res-21-7-final-adopted-1.pdf>

⁴ Appendix 1

Appendix 1: <https://www.aaup.org/news/joint-statement-efforts-restrict-education-about-racism#.Yiadti2z1Ta>

Joint Statement on Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism

At a time when the country is confronting deep-rooted racial inequity and having overdue conversations about our history, legislators in a number of states have moved to restrict teaching about oppression, race, and gender.

We strongly oppose these efforts to stifle education about racism and American history in schools, colleges, and universities. Along with more than seventy other organizations who have signed on to a statement authored by the AAUP, PEN America, the American Historical Association, and the Association of American Colleges & Universities, we affirm that Americans of all ages deserve nothing less than a free and open exchange about history and the forces that shape our world today. Read the joint statement below.

Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History

June 16, 2021

We, the undersigned associations and organizations, state our firm opposition to a spate of legislative proposals being introduced across the country that target academic lessons, presentations, and discussions of racism and related issues in American history in schools, colleges and universities. These efforts have taken varied shape in at least 20 states, but often the legislation aims to prohibit or impede the teaching and education of students concerning what are termed “divisive concepts.” These divisive concepts as defined in numerous bills are a litany of vague and indefinite buzzwords and phrases including, for example, “that any individual should feel or be made to feel discomfort, guilt, anguish, or any other form of psychological or emotional distress on account of that individual's race or sex.” These legislative efforts are deeply troubling for numerous reasons.

First, these bills risk infringing on the right of faculty to teach and of students to learn. The clear goal of these efforts is to suppress teaching and learning about the role of racism in the history of the United States. Purportedly, any examination of racism in this country’s classrooms might cause some students “discomfort” because it is an uncomfortable and complicated subject. But the ideal of informed citizenship necessitates an educated public. Educators must provide an accurate view of the past in order to better prepare students for community participation and robust civic engagement. Suppressing or watering down discussion of “divisive concepts” in educational institutions deprives students of opportunities to discuss and foster solutions to social division and injustice. Legislation cannot erase “concepts” or history; it can, however, diminish educators’ ability to help students address facts in an honest and open environment capable of nourishing intellectual exploration. Educators owe students a clear-eyed, nuanced, and frank delivery of history so that they can learn, grow, and confront the issues of the day, not hew to some state-ordered ideology.

Second, these legislative efforts seek to substitute political mandates for the considered judgment of professional educators, hindering students’ ability to learn and engage in critical thinking across differences and disagreements. These regulations constitute an inappropriate attempt to transfer responsibility for the evaluation of a curriculum and subject matter from educators to elected officials. The purpose of education is to serve the common good by promoting open inquiry and advancing human knowledge. Politicians in a democratic society should not manipulate public school curricula to advance partisan or ideological aims. In higher education, under principles of

academic freedom that have been widely endorsed, professors are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject. Educators, not politicians, should make decisions about teaching and learning.

Knowledge of the past exists to serve the needs of the living. In the current context, this includes an honest reckoning with all aspects of that past. Americans of all ages deserve nothing less than a free and open exchange about history and the forces that shape our world today, an exchange that should take place inside the classroom as well as in the public realm generally. To ban the tools that enable those discussions is to deprive us all of the tools necessary for citizenship in the 21st century. A white-washed view of history cannot change what happened in the past. A free and open society depends on the unrestricted pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

Signed,

American Association of University Professors
American Historical Association
Association of American Colleges & Universities
PEN America

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
ACPA-College Student Educators International
African American Intellectual History Society
African Studies Association
Agricultural History Society
Alcohol and Drugs History Society
American Academy of Religion
American Anthropological Association
American Association for State and Local History
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Association of Community Colleges
American Association of Geographers
American Association of Hispanics in Higher Education
American Catholic Historical Association
American Classical League
American Council of Learned Societies
American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
American Counseling Association
American Educational Research Association
American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO
American Folklore Society
American Humor Studies Association
American Library Association
American Philosophical Association
American Political Science Association
American Psychoanalytic Association
American Society for Engineering Education
American Society for Environmental History
American Society for Theatre Research

American Society of Criminology Executive Board
American Sociological Association
American Studies Association
Anti-Defamation League
Association for Ancient Historians
Association for Asian American Studies
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Counselor Education and Supervision
Association for Documentary Editing
Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies
Association for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies
Association for the Study of African American Life and History
Association for the Study of Higher Education
Association for the Study of Literature and Environment
Association for Theatre in Higher Education
Association of Academic Museums and Galleries
Association of African American Museums
Association of College and Research Libraries
Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
Association of Research Libraries
Association of University Presses
Association of Writers & Writing Programs
Berkshire Conference of Women Historians
Business History Conference
Center for Research Libraries
Central European History Society
Chinese Historians in the United States
ClassCrits, Inc.
Coalition of Urban & Metropolitan Universities (CUMU)
College Art Association
Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, & Transgender History
Comparative & International Education Society
Conference on Asian History
Conference on Faith and History
Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes
Contemporary Freudian Society
Coordinating Council for Women in History
Council on Social Work Education
Czechoslovak Studies Association
Dance Studies Association
Executive Committee of the American Comparative Literature Association
Forum on Early-Modern Empires and Global Interactions
French Colonial Historical Society
German Studies Association
Higher Learning Commission
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities
Historical Society of Twentieth Century China

Immigration Ethnic History Society
International Studies Association
International Society for the Study of Trauma and Dissociation
Italian American Studies Association
John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education
Keats-Shelley Association of America
Labor and Working-Class History Association
Middle East Studies Association
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
Midwestern History Association
Modern Language Association
NAFSA: Association of International Educators
NASPA - Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education
National Association for College Admission Counseling
National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education
National Association of Dean and Directors Schools of Social Work
National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education
National Association of Graduate-Professional Students
National Association of Social Workers
National Coalition for History
National Council for the Social Studies
National Council of Teachers of English
National Council on Public History
National Education Association
Network for Public Education
National Prevention Science Coalition to Improve Lives
National Women's Studies Association
New England Commission of Higher Education
North American Conference on British Studies
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities
Ohio Academy of History
Organization of American Historians
Pacific Coast Branch-American Historical Association
Peace History Society
Phi Beta Kappa Society
Popular Culture Association
Radical History Review
Rhetoric Society of America
Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media
Scholars at Risk
Shakespeare Association of America
Society for Austrian and Habsburg History
Society for Classical Studies
Society for Community Research and Action
Society for Ethnomusicology
Society for French Historical Studies
Society for Historians of the Early American Republic
Society for Historians of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era

Society for Historical Archaeology
Society for the Study of Early Modern Women and Gender
Society for the Study of Social Problems
Society for the Study of the Multi-Ethnic Literature of the United States
Society for US Intellectual History
Society of American Historians
Society of Architectural Historians
Society of Civil War Historians
Society of Transnational Academic Researchers (STAR Scholars Network)
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges
Southern Historical Association
The Authors Guild
The Freedom to Read Foundation
United Faculty of Florida - University of Florida, NEA/AFT/FEA, AFL-CIO
University Film and Video Association
Urban History Association
WASC Senior College and University Commission
Western History Association
Western Society for French History
Women in French
World History Association

Publication Date:

Wednesday, June 16, 2021



**A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CHANGES TO THE CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY
(22/12)**

WHEREAS, GW’s Code of Academic Integrity (hereafter “the Code) should undergo regular revision, at least every five years;

WHEREAS, the definitions of academic integrity violations should be clarified and provide education about academic integrity; and

WHEREAS, all parties will benefit from clearer guidance about academic integrity procedures;

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

That the Faculty Senate recommend the proposed changes to the Code of Academic Integrity (summarized below and detailed in Appendix 1 “Redline of Proposed Changes”) be implemented effective July 1, 2022.

- a. Revising the definitions for all forms of academic integrity in order to accomplish the following:
 - i. Clarify whether or not each form of academic integrity must be evidenced by intent or knowledge;
 - ii. Provide instructors and students with definitions that can be used as tools for education about academic integrity;
 - iii. Provide definitions that align with evolving forms of academic integrity violations;
 - iv. Provide definitions that more clearly specify what constitutes an academic exercise;
 - v. Position dishonesty of a non-academic nature to be consistently resolved through the Code of Student Conduct.
- b. Changing all references to “days” to “business days” to promote clear and consistent interpretation.
- c. Require the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities to publish guidance regarding the timeline of days for document submission in the event of an Academic Integrity Panel.

Educational Policy & Technology Committee
March 23, 2022

Appendix 2

Clean Copy of Proposed Changes

Code of Academic Integrity

Preamble

We, the Students, Faculty, Librarians, Staff, and Administration of the George Washington University, believing academic integrity to be central to the mission of the University, commit ourselves to promoting high standards for the integrity of academic work. Commitment to academic integrity upholds educational equity, development, and dissemination of meaningful knowledge, and mutual respect that our community values and nurtures. The George Washington University Code of Academic Integrity is established to further this commitment.

Article I: The Authority of the Code of Academic Integrity

Section 1: Application of the Code of Academic Integrity

The Code of Academic Integrity (“Code”) shall apply to students enrolled in all colleges and schools within the University, except the following schools and programs:

- 1) The Law School and
- 2) The Medical Doctor Program in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

Section 2: Precedence of the Code of Academic Integrity

This Code takes precedent over all other academic integrity policies of the George Washington University (except as referenced in Section I). This Code applies to reports of academic integrity violations that are received by the University on or after the effective date of this Code, regardless of when the alleged violation occurred. Where the date of the reported violation precedes the effective date of this Code, the definitions of academic integrity violations in existence at the time of the alleged incident will be used, except where use of such definition would be contrary to law. The remainder of this Code, however, including the procedures, will be used to resolve all reports of academic integrity violations subject to this Code made on or after the effective date of the Code, regardless of when the alleged incident occurred.

Section 3: Interpretation

Conflicts or questions about this Code (including its interaction with other policies of the University) should be forwarded to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (“Provost”). The Provost or a designee shall be the final interpreter of this Code.

This Code and any changes to it will be interpreted to comply with applicable legal requirements.

Article II: Basic Considerations

Students are responsible for the honesty and integrity of their own academic work, which may also include their applications for admission, in addition to any group or collaborative academic work attributed to them that is submitted for academic evaluation or credit in an academic course, program, or credential. Behavior not addressed by this Code may be addressed by another policy at the University.

Section 1: Definition of Academic Integrity Violations

- (a) Academic integrity violations are cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one's ownwork, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate authorization, and the fabrication of information.

- (b) For purposes of this Code, an academic exercise can be any student activity, document, record, or similar submitted for review by an instructor, teaching assistant, or similar course official as part of a course or course of study in which the student is registered or seeks to register. This includes but is not limited to graded assignments, drafts submitted for review, discussion board postings, simulations, comprehensive exams, dissertations, admission applications for academic programs, or other products in pursuit of any academic credential.

Attempts to commit acts prohibited by this Code constitute a violation of this Code and may be sanctioned to the same extent as completed violations, even if such attempts are unsuccessful or incomplete.

(c) Common examples of academic integrity violations include, but are not limited to, the following, whether they occur in-person or remotely:

- 1) Cheating: Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise; engaging in unauthorized collaboration in any academic exercise; submitting work for an in-class examination that has been prepared in advance without authorization; copying from another student's examination; representing material prepared by another as one's own work (including contract or paid cheating); violating rules governing administration of examinations; violating any rules relating to the academic integrity of a course or program.
- 2) Fabrication: Falsifying any data, information, or citation in an academic exercise.
- 3) Plagiarism: misrepresenting words, ideas, or a sequence of ideas as original or one's own. Plagiarism can include intentional plagiarism, failure to attribute, improper paraphrase, and/or self-plagiarism as described below:
 - ***Intentional plagiarism***: Deliberately or knowingly using and representing another person's words, ideas, sequence of ideas, data, and/or other work material without proper acknowledgment, citation, or attribution. Material does not need to be copied verbatim to constitute intentional plagiarism. Contract or paid cheating may constitute intentional plagiarism.
 - ***Failure to attribute***: Use and/or representation of another's words, ideas, sequence of ideas, data, and/or other work material without the necessary in-text attribution to credit the original author of those materials. In-text attributions include, but are not limited to, parenthetical citations, footnotes, or other notations that attribute academic material to the original source.
 - ***Improper paraphrase***: Use of direct language, including phrases or full sentences, from source material without including quotation marks; the lack of quotation marks misrepresents those words as belonging to the writer, even when an in-text citation or equivalent is given. If the writer's text echoes the word choice of the source material and that echoed word choice is not in quotation marks, the result is likely improper paraphrasing, even if an in-text citation is included. Proper paraphrasing requires source material to be restated in the words of the writer and attributed to the original author via an in-text citation or equivalent.
 - ***Self-plagiarism***: Submission of work previously-submitted for credit in whole or in part as if the new submission is original work or the concurrent submission of material to more than one course. Such submission is prohibited unless the instructor of record explicitly permits it on a given assignment.

- 4) Falsification and forgery of University academic documents: Falsification, alteration, concealing material information, making false statements, or misrepresentation of academic documents, including but not limited to academic transcripts, academic documentation, letters of recommendation, admissions applications, or related documents.
- 5) Facilitating academic integrity violations: Taking any action that a person knows or reasonably should know will assist another person in violating this Code. This may include circumstances in which the facilitator is not enrolled in the course.
- 6) Sanction Violation: Violating the terms of any sanction assigned in accordance with this Code.

Section 2: Reporting violations

It is the communal responsibility of members of the George Washington University to respond to suspected academic integrity violations by:

- 1) consulting the individual(s) thought to be involved and encouraging them to report it themselves, and/or
- 2) reporting it to the instructor of record for the course, and/or
- 3) reporting it to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. Reporting oneself after committing academic integrity violations is strongly encouraged and may be considered a mitigating factor in determining sanctions.

Section 3: Assignments and Examinations

- (a) The instructor of record for a given course is solely responsible for establishing academic assignments and methods of examination in that course.
- (b) Instructors of record are encouraged to provide clear explanations of their expectations regarding the completion of assignments and examinations, including permissible collaboration. This includes detailed examples about what collaboration is and is not permitted and what resources may and may not be used.
- (c) Instructors of record are encouraged to choose assignments and methods of examination believed to promote academic integrity. Examples of these include opportunities to display critical thinking around a unique set of issues, creative assessments developed by students, careful proctoring of examinations, and the regular creation of fresh exams and assignments. Nothing in this Code is intended to eliminate or prohibit the use of collaborative projects or unproctored examinations or other assessments. When assigning collaborative projects or using unproctored examinations, the instructor of record should explicitly state the expectations of performance for all participants.
- (d) Instructors of record are encouraged to provide opportunities for students to affirm their commitment to academic integrity in various settings, including examinations and other assignments. The following statement may be used for this purpose: "I, (student's name), affirm that I have completed this assignment/examination in accordance with the Code of Academic Integrity."

Article III: The University Integrity and Conduct Council

Section 1: Mission of the University Integrity and Conduct Council

- (a) The University Integrity and Conduct Council (UICC) will be responsible for promoting

academic integrity and for administering all procedures in this Code.

(b) Administrative and logistical support for the UICC shall be provided by the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities, within the Division for Student Affairs. The Office shall be the repository for records pertaining to this Code and the UICC.

Section 2: Composition of the UICC and Academic Integrity Panels (AIPs)

(a) The UICC shall include student and faculty members from each of the schools whose students are subject to this Code. The terms of all members shall be one academic year. Members may be renewed for additional terms. The process for identifying and selecting candidates to serve on the UICC shall be determined by the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities, pursuant to Article III, Section 3, below. Recruitment should yield broad and diverse representation of the University community.

(b) The Academic Integrity Panels (AIP), which are selected from members of the UICC, shall adjudicate cases referred to a hearing under this Code. The Director of the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities or a designee (the "Director") will select and convene AIPs as needed. An AIP shall be comprised of three student members (one of whom serves as presiding officer) and two faculty members. At least one member should be from the school or college of the course in which the violation was reported. If UICC members from the school or college of the course are unavailable to adjudicate a case, the Director may appoint other UICC members as substitutes.

(c) The presiding officer for an individual case shall be a student member of the AIP and shall be selected by the Director or designee prior to the start of an AIP. The presiding officer may participate but will have no vote in the deliberations or recommending a sanction at the hearing, except in the circumstances outlined below. Following the hearing, the presiding officer will write a report on the hearing.

(d) In the event a full AIP cannot be convened in a timely manner, a case may be heard by an Ad-Hoc AIP, consisting of at least one student and one faculty member, so long as both the instructor of record and the respondent agree. In such an event, a student will serve as the presiding officer and all students (including the presiding officer) and faculty members will have the ability to vote to resolve the case.

(e) Any case that arises before or during a summer, academic, or holiday break period may be heard during that same break period providing that members of the UICC are available. Otherwise, the case will be adjudicated during the following academic term.

(f) All members of the UICC shall participate in training organized by the Director or designee.

Section 3: Selection and Removal of UICC Members

(a) Annually and typically by July 1 preceding a new academic year, the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities will handle the nomination, application, and selection processes of the UICC members who will serve in the next academic year. The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities may confer with the following entities in the nomination and selection process:

- 1) the Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Educational Policy and Technology;
- 2) GW's academic deans of schools or colleges subject to this Code;
- 3) the President of the Student Association and student associations of the schools and colleges

subject to the Code or a designee; and

4) other offices and student leaders at the University to promote diverse membership that represents the academic and demographic identities of the University communities.

(b) The following criteria shall be used in the selection of the student members:

- 1) They must be students registered for at least three credit hours in a degree-granting program of a school or college subject to this Code;
- 2) They must have made satisfactory academic progress and be in good academic standing;
- 3) Students with a pending case or incomplete sanctions may not be selected for the UICC. Students with resolved cases and who have completed all sanctions may be selected at the discretion of the Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities or designee;
- 4) They may not hold any executive position, either elected or appointed, in the Student Association.

(c) The following criteria shall be used in the selection of the faculty members:

- 1) They must be full-time faculty members in a school or college subject to this Code;
- 2) They may not be elected members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

(d) Current members of the UICC who are alleged to have committed any violation of this Code, the Code of Student Conduct, or any other university policy shall be suspended from participation during the pendency of any investigation or proceeding into the alleged violation. Members found in violation of this Code or the Code of Student Conduct shall be disqualified from any further participation in the UICC until all sanctions are completed and with the approval of the Director. Faculty members serving as an instructor of record or witness in a pending case under this Code shall not participate on an AIP until that case is resolved.

(e) The UICC, by a two-thirds vote of the membership, or the Director may remove a member for non-participation. The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities may define additional expectations of participation for the UICC membership.

(f) Vacancies, as they occur, shall be filled by the Director.

Section 4: Case Procedures

(a) All attendant procedures and records of the UICC and its AIPs, from the initial allegation to the final resolution, shall be confidential, to the extent allowed by applicable law and university policy.

(b) In any circumstance where the matter is referred to the department chair or other comparable official, that person may assume the role of instructor of record for purposes of the academic integrity case process.

(c) Allegations involving violations of this Code may be initiated by instructors of record, students, librarians, or administrators. Anyone with awareness of a violation may report it to the instructor of record or the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. Any allegations should be made as expeditiously as is reasonably possible (normally within ten business days except in the summer or during academic breaks and holidays) from the discovery of the alleged violation. Allegations may

be initiated as follows:

- 1) A student may initiate an allegation of academic integrity violations against another student, by referring the case to the instructor of record and/or to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. If the case is brought directly to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities for action, then the Director shall promptly notify the instructor of record. If the instructor of record will not or is unable to address the case, the matter will be referred to the department chair or other comparable official.
- 2) When an instructor of record reports an allegation or is made aware of a violation that the instructor of record determines to be substantive, the instructor of record shall contact the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities in order to discover whether the student has ever been found in violation of this Code.
- 3) However reported, the instructor of record will present the student with specific allegations and may propose a sanction. The instructor of record may consult with the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities on sanctioning considerations. Sanctions will be determined in accordance with the relevant sections of this Code.

If the instructor of record declines to propose a sanction, the matter will be referred to the department chair or other comparable official for proposed sanctions.

- 4) In the event a student withdraws or drops the relevant course while a case is pending, the case may still proceed under this Code.
- 5) Cases may be resolved by one of the following:
 - a) Academic Integrity Agreements, in which both the respondent and the instructor of record agree to the finding of violation for all allegations and sanctions, in accordance with Section 5 of this Code. The written agreement will be provided to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities to advise regarding sanctioning consistency, with the final determination being the mutual agreement of the instructor of record and respondent, evidenced by each person's signature.
 - b) Determination by the AIPs when the respondent does not accept responsibility for the alleged violations or does not accept the proposed sanction. In such cases, the AIP will review the case in accordance with the procedural guidelines outlined below.
- 6) All actions, on any level, shall be recorded with the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. Instructors of record must notify and submit the appropriate documentation about any violation of this Code to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities for proper retention of records.

(d) The following procedures shall guide AIP Hearings.

- 1) Respondents and instructors of record shall be given notice of the hearing date and the specific allegations at least five business days in advance and shall be accorded reasonable access to the case file, which will be retained in the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. The appropriate academic dean, department chair, and the Vice President of Student Affairs and Dean of Students, or any designees shall also receive notification of the pending allegations at least five business days before the hearing. The timeline for collection and distribution of documents from instructors of record and respondents will be in accordance with published procedures developed by the Director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities or designee.

- 2) Any party may challenge an AIP member on the grounds of personal bias. In such cases, AIP members may be disqualified from the hearing at the determination of the Director.
- 3) Hearings will be closed to the public, without exception. Prospective witnesses, other than the instructor of record and respondent, shall be excluded from the hearing except while providing their statements. All parties and witnesses shall be excluded from AIP deliberations.
- 4) The respondent may be accompanied by an advisor. The role of the advisor shall be limited to consultation with the respondent they are advising. Under no circumstances are advisors permitted to address the AIP, speak on behalf of their advisee, or question other participants. At the discretion of the presiding officer, violations of this limitation will result in the advisor being removed from the hearing. The University retains the right to have legal counsel present at any hearing.
- 5) Hearings will occur in the absence of respondents who fail to appear after proper notice. If respondent(s) fail to appear, the instructor of record will still be required to present a case.
- 6) The presiding officer shall exercise control over the proceedings to achieve orderly and timely completion of the hearing. Any person, including the instructor of record and respondent, who disrupts a hearing may be excluded by the presiding officer. The presiding officer shall direct the hearing through the following stages: statements from both the instructor of record and respondent, questioning of witnesses by both the instructor of record and respondent, the questioning of the instructor of record, respondent, and any witnesses by panel members, and concluding statements by the instructor of record and respondent.
- 7) Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the investigatory model of administrative hearings, in which the AIP assumes responsibility for eliciting relevant evidence. The purpose of the hearing is to establish the facts. The standard of proof for making a finding of in violation will be the preponderance of evidence standard (i.e., based on the evidence presented, it is more likely than not that a violation occurred). Where the AIP vote outcome is tied, the preponderance of evidence standard has not been met and the AIP's decision is that the respondent will be found not in violation.
- 8) Formal rules of evidence shall not be applicable in proceedings conducted pursuant to this Code. The presiding officer shall have the discretion to admit all matters into evidence that reasonable persons would accept as relevant.
- 9) Hearings will be recorded. These recordings will be retained as part of the record.
- 10) The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities or the presiding officer may request the attendance of witnesses upon request by any AIP member or of either party. Only witnesses who can provide direct knowledge about the given case shall be called. Requests must be approved by the Director. University students and employees are expected to comply with such requests. Instructors of record and respondents shall be accorded an opportunity to question those witnesses who participate for either party at the hearing. Failure of witnesses to appear will not invalidate the proceedings.

11) Witnesses shall be asked to affirm that their statement is truthful. Any student, faculty, or staff member who knowingly provides false information during this process will be referred to Student Rights & Responsibilities, Human Resources, and/or the Office of the Provost as appropriate for review and appropriate disposition.

In lieu of oral statements, authenticated written statements or other forms of participation may be accepted at the discretion of the Director.

12) AIP's deliberation following the hearing shall occur in two stages: the determination regarding responsibility and if applicable, recommendation of sanctions. To find a respondent in violation of the Code, a majority of the voting AIP members must agree. If the AIP finds a respondent in violation, they shall also make a sanctioning recommendation. A sanction other than expulsion can be recommended by the affirmative vote of three-quarters of the voting AIP members. In the event of a tie regarding sanctions other than expulsion, the presiding officer casts the deciding vote. A sanction of expulsion can be recommended only by an affirmative vote of all voting AIP members.

13) Reports of the AIP shall include a determination of the responsibility of the respondent. If the respondent is found in violation, then the report will also include a recommendation of sanctions. Sanctions will be recommended and determined in accordance with the relevant sections of this Code. If an AIP determines that a respondent is in violation of the Code, the report shall be forwarded to the dean of the school in which the academic integrity violation occurred or a designee without a conflict of interest in the case, as determined by the dean. If in the judgement of the dean or designee the sanction recommended by the AIP is a significant deviation from the sanctions imposed in closely similar cases, the dean or designee may revise the sanction before notifying the respondent of the determination and sanction. The dean or designee may not modify or revise the AIP's determination of responsibility. The instructor of record and department chair of the course shall receive a copy of the determination and sanction.

14) These proceedings should be concluded as expeditiously as possible. The AIPs should strive to have proceedings concluded within four weeks of the report of the violation. However, failure to do so shall not constitute improper procedure under the Code.

Section 5: Sanctions

- a) In each case, the following factors may be considered in determining an appropriate sanction:
- 1) the nature of the violation and the incident itself;
 - 2) the significance of the assignment(s) in question to the academic course or program;
 - 3) evidence of intent or lack thereof by the respondent in committing the violation;
 - 4) the impact or implications of the conduct on the University community and its learning environments;
 - 5) prior misconduct by the respondent, including the respondent's relevant prior academic integrity or behavioral misconduct history or lack thereof, both at the University and elsewhere;
 - 6) maintenance of an environment conducive to the integrity of learning and knowledge;

- 7) protection of the University community;
 - 8) necessary outcomes in order to eliminate the prohibited conduct, prevent its recurrence, and remedy its effects on members of the University community; and,
 - 9) any mitigating, aggravating, or compelling circumstances in order to reach a just and appropriate resolution in each case, including the respondent's demonstration of the understanding and impact of the violation.
- b) Possible sanctions include, but are not limited to, the following:
- 1) educational sanctions intended to improve the respondent's understanding and implementation of academic integrity. This may be assigned in combination with any other sanction. If the respondent fails to complete these sanctions, a registration hold may be placed on their student account.
 - 2) reduction in academic credit for the assignment or course.
 - 3) failure of assignment (generally recommended for first violation).
 - 4) failure of course, including a transcript notation until graduation and successful petition for removal (generally recommended for second violations or egregious first violations).
 - 5) suspension from the University for a specified period of time, including a transcript notation until seven years from the date of the incident and successful petition for removal. Suspension may include requirements the student will need to complete in order to return or upon return.
 - 6) expulsion (permanent removal from the University), including a permanent transcript notation.
- c) Neither suspensions nor expulsions may be imposed through an Academic Integrity Agreement.
- d) Transcript notations for failure of course or suspensions may be removed upon expiration of the dates set forth above and only after successful petition of the respondent to the Provost or designee.
- e) Records shall be maintained and released by the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities in accordance with University policy and applicable law.
- f) Following graduation or removal of transcript notation, whichever is later, the respondent's record will be transferred to an administrative archive status and therefore become internal and administrative (i.e. non-conduct) records. Such files are not part of general third-party releases, even with authorization from the respondent. Such records may be released to third-parties upon specific request of the respondent or as required by law.
- g) Respondents found in violation of this Code may also be removed from or determined to be ineligible for certain University programs or activities, in accordance with the policies, rules, or eligibility criteria of that program or activity.
- h) No outcome shall prohibit any program, department, college, or school of the University from retaining records of violations and reporting violations as required by their professional

standards. The University may retain, for appropriate administrative purposes, records of all proceedings regarding violations of this Code.

- i) Sanctions assigned to a respondent found in violation of this Code may also have subsequent ramifications upon their academic standing in an academic course or academic program in accordance with the faculty member's syllabus or in the academic college, school, or department regulations and bylaws.

Section 6: Appeals

- (a) After a decision has been confirmed by the relevant dean or designee, the respondent may file a written petition of appeal with the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities within five (5) business days of the outcome.
- (b) Appeals of the decision of the AIP or of the sanction imposed by the relevant dean or designee may be based only on the following grounds:
 - 1) There was a material deviation from the procedures of this Code that affected the outcome.
 - 2) There is new and relevant information that was unavailable at the time of the proceeding, with reasonable diligence and effort that could materially affect the outcome.
- (c) Appeals will be reviewed by the Provost or a designee. The Provost or a designee will then make a decision on the appeal, based on the appeal petition and the reports of the AIP and the relevant dean or designee. The appeal decision of the Provost will typically be rendered and provided to the instructor of record and the respondent within 10 business days of the appeal materials being received by the Provost.
- (d) The decision of the Provost or designee in connection with the appeal shall be final and conclusive and no further appeals will be permitted. The dean of the respondent's home school at the University shall also receive final notice of the case outcome.

Article IV: Changes and Reports Regarding the Code of Academic Integrity

Section 1: Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity

- (a) Substantial changes to this Code shall be referred to or initiated by the Provost or designee. Changes may also be initiated by either the Faculty Senate or the Student Association. Substantial changes must be approved by a majority vote of both the Faculty Senate and the Student Association.
- (b) The Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students shall coordinate with the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students through the Provost to conduct a review of the Code of Academic Integrity at least once every five years.
- (c) Substantial changes will then be forwarded to the President of the University for confirmation and submission to the Board of Trustees.

Section 2: Reports and Reviews

The Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students or designee shall make an annual report on the work of the UICC to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, the Faculty Senate Educational Policy and Technology Committee, the Student Association Senate Academic Affairs Committee, and the Council of

Deans.

Effective July 1, 2022

Appendix 1

Appendix—Redline of Proposed Changes

Code of Academic Integrity

Preamble

We, the Students, Faculty, Librarians, Staff, and Administration of the George Washington University, believing academic integrity to be central to the mission of the University, commit ourselves to promoting high standards for the integrity of academic work. Commitment to academic integrity upholds educational equity, development, and dissemination of meaningful knowledge, and mutual respect that our community values and nurtures. The George Washington University Code of Academic Integrity is established to further this commitment.

Article I: The Authority of the Code of Academic Integrity

Section 1: Application of the Code of Academic Integrity

The Code of Academic Integrity (“Code”) shall apply to students enrolled in all colleges and schools within the University, except the following schools and programs:

- 1) The Law School and
- 2) The Medical Doctor Program in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

Section 2: Precedence of the Code of Academic Integrity

This Code takes precedent over all other academic integrity policies of the George Washington University (except as referenced in Section I). This Code applies to reports of academic integrity violations that are received by the University on or after the effective date of this Code, regardless of when the alleged violation occurred. Where the date of the reported violation precedes the effective date of this Code, the definitions of academic integrity violations in existence at the time of the alleged incident will be used, except where use of such definition would be contrary to law. The remainder of this Code, however, including the procedures, will be used to resolve all reports of academic integrity violations subject to this Code made on or after the effective date of the Code, regardless of when the alleged incident occurred.

Section 3: Interpretation

Conflicts or questions about this Code (including its interaction with other policies of the University) should be forwarded to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (“Provost”). The Provost or a designee shall be the final interpreter of this Code.

This Code and any changes to it will be interpreted to comply with applicable legal requirements.

Article II: Basic Considerations

Students are responsible for the honesty and integrity of their own academic work, which may also include their applications for admission, in addition to any group or collaborative academic work attributed to them that is submitted for academic evaluation or credit in an academic course, program, or credential. Behavior not addressed by this Code may be addressed by another policy at the University.

Section 1: Definition of Academic Integrity Violations

- (a) Academic integrity violations are cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one's ownwork, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate authorization, and the fabrication of information.

~~(a)~~(b) For purposes of this Code, an academic exercise ~~is~~ can be any ~~student's~~ activity, document, record, or similar submitted for ~~evaluation of its academic merit~~ review by an instructor, teaching assistant, or similar course official as part of a course or course of study in which the student is registered or seeks to register. This includes but is not limited to graded assignments, drafts submitted for review, discussion board postings, simulations, comprehensive exams, dissertations, admission applications for academic programs, or other products in pursuit of any academic credential.

Attempts to commit acts prohibited by this Code constitute a violation of this Code and may be sanctioned to the same extent as completed violations, even if such attempts are unsuccessful or incomplete.

(c) Common examples of academic integrity violations include, but are not limited to, the following, whether they occur in-person or remotely:

1) Cheating:— Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise; engaging in unauthorized collaboration in any academic exercise; submitting work for an in-class examination that has been prepared in advance without authorization; copying from another student's examination; representing material prepared by another as one's own work (including contract or paid cheating); violating rules governing administration of examinations; violating any rules relating to the academic integrity of a course or program.

~~intentionally or knowingly using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise; engaging in unauthorized collaboration in any academic exercise; copying from another student's examination; submitting work for an in-class examination that has been prepared in advance; representing material prepared by another as one's own work (including contract or paid cheating); submitting the same or substantially the same work in more than one course without prior permission of both instructors; violating rules governing administration of examinations; violating any rules relating to academic integrity of a course or program.~~

2) Fabrication—Falsifying any data, information, or citation in an academic exercise.

~~intentionally or knowingly, without authorization, falsifying or inventing any data, information, or citation in an academic exercise; giving false or misleading information regarding an academic matter.~~

3) Plagiarism: misrepresenting words, ideas, or a sequence of ideas as original or one's own.

Plagiarism ~~and~~ can include intentional plagiarism, failure to attribute, improper paraphrase, and/or self-plagiarism as described below:

- **Intentional plagiarism**: Deliberately or knowingly using and representing another person's words, ideas, sequence of ideas, data, and/or other work material without proper acknowledgment, citation, or attribution. Material does not need to be copied verbatim to constitute intentional plagiarism. Contract or paid cheating may constitute intentional plagiarism.
- **Failure to attribute**: Use and/or representation of another's words, ideas, sequence of ideas, data, and/or other work material without the necessary in-text attribution to credit the original author of those materials. In-text attributions include, but are not limited to, parenthetical citations, footnotes, or other notations that attribute academic material to the original source.

- Improper paraphrase: Use of direct language, including phrases or full sentences, from source material without including quotation marks; -the lack of quotation marks misrepresents those words as belonging to the writer, even when an in-text citation or equivalent is given. If the ~~student~~ writer's text echoes the word choice of the source material and that echoed word choice is ~~not~~ in quotation marks, the result is likely improper paraphrasing, even if an in-text citation is included. Proper paraphrasing requires source material to be restated in the words of the writer and attributed to the original author via an in-text citation or equivalent.
- Self-plagiarism: Submission of work previously-completed/submitted for credit-work in whole or in part as if the new submission is original work or the concurrent submission of material to more than one course. Such submission is prohibited unless the instructor of record explicitly permits it on a given assignment.

~~1) Plagiarism~~—intentionally or knowingly representing the words, ideas, or sequence of ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise; or failure to attribute any of the following: quotations, paraphrases, or borrowed information. Contract or paid cheating may be a form of plagiarism.

4) Falsification and forgery of University academic documents:- Falsification, alteration, concealing material information, making false statements, or misrepresentation of academic documents, including but not limited to academic transcripts, academic documentation, letters of recommendation, admissions applications, or related documents.

- a. intentionally or knowingly making a false statement, concealing material information, or forging a University official's signature on any University academic document or record; making false statements to or concealing material information from a University employee that results in the creation of a false academic record or document. Such academic documents or records may include applications for admission, transcripts, registration/add-drop forms, requests for advanced standing, requests to register for undergraduate or graduate-level courses, etc. (Falsification or forgery of non-academic University documents, such as financial aid forms, may be considered a violation of the Code of Student Conduct and/or other relevant university policies.)

5) Facilitating academic integrity violations:- Taking any action that a person knows or reasonably should know will assist another person in violating this Code. This may include circumstances in which the facilitator is not enrolled in the course.

~~intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another to commit a violation of academic integrity. This may include circumstances in which the facilitator is not enrolled in the course, but is an enrolled student.~~

6) Sanction Violation:- Violating the terms of any sanction assigned in accordance with this Code.

~~violating the terms of any disciplinary sanction imposed in accordance with this Code.~~

Section 2: Reporting violations

It is the communal responsibility of members of the George Washington University to respond to suspected academic integrity violations by:

- 1) consulting the individual(s) thought to be involved and encouraging them to report it themselves, and/or
- 2) reporting it to the instructor of record for the course, and/or

3) reporting it to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. Reporting oneself after committing academic integrity violations is strongly encouraged and may be considered a mitigating factor in determining sanctions.

Section 3: Assignments and Examinations

(a) The instructor of record for a given course is solely responsible for establishing academic assignments and methods of examination in that course.

(b) Instructors of record are encouraged to provide clear explanations of their expectations regarding the completion of assignments and examinations, including permissible collaboration. This includes detailed examples about what collaboration is and is not permitted and what resources may and may not be used.

(c) Instructors of record are encouraged to choose assignments and methods of examination believed to promote academic integrity. Examples of these include opportunities to display critical thinking around a unique set of issues, creative assessments developed by students, careful proctoring of examinations, and the regular creation of fresh exams and assignments. Nothing in this Code is intended to eliminate or prohibit the use of collaborative projects or unproctored examinations or other assessments. When assigning collaborative projects or using unproctored examinations, the instructor of record should explicitly state the expectations of performance for all participants.

(d) Instructors of record are encouraged to provide opportunities for students to affirm their commitment to academic integrity in various settings, including examinations and other assignments. The following statement may be used for this purpose: “I, (student's name), affirm that I have completed this assignment/examination in accordance with the Code of Academic Integrity.”

Article III: The University Integrity and Conduct Council

Section 1: Mission of the University Integrity and Conduct Council

(a) The University Integrity and Conduct Council (UICC) will be responsible for promoting academic integrity and for administering all procedures in this Code.

(b) Administrative and logistical support for the UICC shall be provided by the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities, within the Division for Student Affairs. The Office shall be the repository for records pertaining to this Code and the UICC.

Section 2: Composition of the UICC and Academic Integrity Panels (AIPs)

(a) The UICC shall include student and faculty members from each of the schools whose students are subject to this Code. The terms of all members shall be one academic year. Members may be renewed for additional terms. The process for identifying and selecting candidates to serve on the UICC shall be determined by the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities, pursuant to Article III, Section 3, below. Recruitment should yield broad and diverse representation of the University community.

(b) The Academic Integrity Panels (AIP), which are selected from members of the UICC, shall adjudicate cases referred to a hearing under this Code. The Director of the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities or a designee (the “Director”) will select and convene AIPs as needed. An AIP shall be comprised of three student members (one of whom serves as presiding officer) and two faculty members. At least one member should be from the school or college of the course in which the violation was reported. If UICC members from the school or college of the course are unavailable to adjudicate a case, the Director may appoint other UICC members as substitutes.

(c) The presiding officer for an individual case shall be a student member of the AIP and shall be selected by the Director or designee prior to the start of an AIP hearing. The presiding officer may participate but will have no vote in the deliberations or recommending a sanction at the hearing, except in the circumstances outlined below. Following the hearing, the presiding officer will write a report on the hearing.

(d) In the event a full AIP cannot be convened in a timely manner, a case may be heard by an Ad-Hoc AIP, consisting of at least one student and one faculty member, so long as both the instructor of record and the respondent agree. In such an event, a student will serve as the presiding officer and all students (including the presiding officer) and faculty members will have the ability to vote to resolve the case.

(e) Any case that arises before or during a summer, academic, or holiday break period may be heard during that same break period providing that members of the UICC are available. Otherwise, the case will be adjudicated during the following academic term.

(f) All members of the UICC shall participate in training organized by the Director or designee.

Section 3: Selection and Removal of UICC Members

(a) Annually and typically by July 1 preceding a new academic year, the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities will handle the nomination, application, and selection processes of the UICC members who will serve in the next academic year. The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities may confer with the following entities in the nomination and selection process:

- 1) the Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Educational Policy and Technology;
- 2) GW's academic deans of schools or colleges subject to this Code;
- 3) the President of the Student Association and student associations of the schools and colleges subject to the Code or a designee; and
- 4) other offices and student leaders at the University to promote diverse membership that represents the academic and demographic identities of the University communities.

(b) The following criteria shall be used in the selection of the student members:

- 1) They must be students registered for at least three credit hours in a degree-granting program of a school or college subject to this Code;
- 2) They must have made satisfactory academic progress and be in good academic standing;
- 3) Students with a pending case or incomplete sanctions may not be selected for the UICC. Students with resolved cases and who have completed all sanctions may be selected at the discretion of the Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities or designee;
- 4) They may not hold any executive position, either elected or appointed, in the Student Association.

(c) The following criteria shall be used in the selection of the faculty members:

- 1) They must be full-time faculty members in a school or college subject to this Code;

2) They may not be elected members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

(d) Current members of the UICC who are alleged to have committed any violation of this Code, the Code of Student Conduct, or any other university policy shall be suspended from participation during the pendency of any investigation or proceeding into the alleged violation. Members found in violation of this Code or the Code of Student Conduct shall be disqualified from any further participation in the UICC until all sanctions are completed and with the approval of the Director. Faculty members serving as an instructor of record or witness in a pending case under this Code shall not participate on an AIP until that case is resolved.

(e) The UICC, by a two-thirds vote of the membership, or the Director may remove a member for non-participation. The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities may define additional expectations of participation for the UICC membership.

(f) Vacancies, as they occur, shall be filled by the Director.

Section 4: Case Procedures

(a) All attendant procedures and records of the UICC and its AIPs, from the initial allegation to the final resolution, shall be confidential, to the extent allowed by applicable law and university policy.

(b) In any circumstance where the matter is referred to the department chair or other comparable official, that person may assume the role of instructor of record for purposes of the academic integrity case process.

(c) Allegations involving violations of this Code may be initiated by instructors of record, students, librarians, or administrators. Anyone with awareness of a violation may report it to the instructor of record or the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. Any allegations should be made as expeditiously as is reasonably possible (normally within ten business days except in the summer or during academic breaks and holidays) from the discovery of the alleged violation. Allegations may be initiated as follows:

- 1) A student may initiate an allegation of academic integrity violations against another student, by referring the case to the instructor of record and/or to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. If the case is brought directly to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities for action, then the Director shall promptly notify the instructor of record. If the instructor of record will not or is unable to address the case, the matter will be referred to the department chair or other comparable official.
- 2) When an instructor of record reports an allegation or is made aware of a violation that the instructor of record determines to be substantive, the instructor of record shall contact the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities in order to discover whether the student has ever been found in violation of this Code.
- 3) However reported, the instructor of record will present the student with specific allegations and may propose a sanction. The instructor of record may consult with the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities on sanctioning considerations. Sanctions will be determined in accordance with the relevant sections of this Code.

If the instructor of record declines to propose a sanction, the matter will be referred to the department chair or other comparable official for proposed sanctions.

- 4) In the event a student withdraws or drops the relevant course while a case is pending, the case may still proceed under this Code.
- 5) Cases may be resolved by one of the following:
 - a) Academic Integrity Agreements, in which both the respondent and the instructor of record agree to the finding of violation for all allegations and sanctions, in accordance with Section 5 of this Code. The written agreement will be provided to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities to advise regarding sanctioning consistency, with the final determination being the mutual agreement of the instructor of record and respondent, evidenced by each person's signature.
 - b) Determination by the AIPs when the respondent does not accept responsibility for the alleged violations or does not accept the proposed sanction. In such cases, the AIP will review the case in accordance with the procedural guidelines outlined below.
- 6) All actions, on any level, shall be recorded with the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. Instructors of record must notify and submit the appropriate documentation about any violation of this Code to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities for proper retention of records.

(c) The following procedures shall guide AIP Hearings.

1) Respondents and instructors of record shall be given notice of the hearing date and the specific allegations at least five ~~calendar~~ business days in advance and shall be accorded reasonable access to the case file, which will be retained in the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. The appropriate academic dean, department chair, and the Vice President of Student Affairs and Dean of Students, or any designees shall also receive notification of the pending allegations at least five ~~calendar~~ business days before the hearing. The timeline for collection and distribution of documents from instructors of record and respondents will be in accordance with published procedures developed by the Director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities or designee.

2) Any party may challenge an AIP member on the grounds of personal bias. In such cases, AIP members may be disqualified from the hearing at the determination of the Director.

3) Hearings will be closed to the public, without exception. Prospective witnesses, other than the instructor of record and respondent, shall be excluded from the hearing except while providing their statements. All parties and witnesses shall be excluded from AIP deliberations.

4) The respondent may be accompanied by an advisor. The role of the advisor shall be limited to consultation with the respondent they are advising. Under no circumstances are advisors permitted to address the AIP, speak on behalf of their advisee, or question other participants. At the discretion of the presiding officer, violations of this limitation will result in the advisor being removed from the hearing. The University retains the right to have legal counsel present at any hearing.

5) Hearings will occur in the absence of respondents who fail to appear after proper notice. If respondent(s) fail to appear, the instructor of record will still be required to present a case.

~~5)6)~~ The presiding officer shall exercise control over the proceedings to achieve orderly and timely completion of the hearing. Any person, including the instructor of record and respondent, who disrupts a hearing may be excluded by the presiding officer. The presiding officer shall direct the hearing through the following stages: statements from both the instructor of record and respondent, questioning of witnesses by both the instructor of record and respondent, the questioning of the instructor of record, respondent, and any witnesses by panel members, and concluding statements by the instructor of record and respondent.

~~6)7)~~ Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the investigatory model of administrative hearings, in which the AIP assumes responsibility for eliciting relevant evidence. The purpose of the hearing is to establish the facts. The standard of proof for making a finding of in violation will be the preponderance of evidence standard (i.e., based on the evidence presented, it is more likely than not that a violation occurred). Where the AIP vote outcome is tied, the preponderance of evidence standard has not been met and the AIP's decision is that the respondent will be found not in violation.

~~7)8)~~ Formal rules of evidence shall not be applicable in proceedings conducted pursuant to this Code. The presiding officer shall have the discretion to admit all matters into evidence that reasonable persons would accept as relevant.

~~8)9)~~ Hearings will be recorded. These recordings will be retained as part of the record.

~~9)10)~~ The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities or the presiding officer may request the attendance of witnesses upon request by any AIP member or of either party. Only witnesses who can provide direct knowledge about the given case shall be called. Requests must be approved by the Director. University students and employees are expected to comply with such requests. Instructors of record and respondents shall be accorded an opportunity to question those witnesses who participate for either party at the hearing. Failure of witnesses to appear will not invalidate the proceedings.

~~10)11)~~ Witnesses shall be asked to affirm that their statement is truthful. Any student, faculty, or staff member who knowingly provides false information during this process will be referred to Student Rights & Responsibilities, Human Resources, and/or the Office of the Provost as appropriate for review and appropriate disposition.

In lieu of oral statements, authenticated written statements or other forms of participation may be accepted at the discretion of the Director.

~~11)12)~~ AIP's deliberation following the hearing shall occur in two stages: the determination regarding responsibility and if applicable, recommendation of sanctions. To find a respondent in violation of the Code, a majority of the voting AIP members must agree. If the AIP finds a respondent in violation, they shall also make a sanctioning recommendation. A sanction other than expulsion can be recommended by the affirmative vote of three-quarters of the voting AIP members. In the event of a tie regarding sanctions other than expulsion, the presiding officer casts the deciding vote. A sanction of expulsion can be recommended only by an affirmative vote of all voting AIP members.

~~12)13)~~ Reports of the AIP shall include a determination of the responsibility of the respondent. If the respondent is found in violation, then the report will also include a recommendation of sanctions. Sanctions will be recommended and determined in accordance with the relevant sections of this Code. If an AIP determines that a respondent

is in violation of the Code, thereport shall be forwarded to the dean of the school in which the academic integrity violation occurred or a designee without a conflict of interest in the case, as determined by the dean. If in the judgement of the dean or designee the sanction recommended by the AIP is a significant deviation from the sanctions imposed in closely similar cases, the dean or designee may revise the sanction before notifying the respondent of the determination and sanction. The dean or designee may not modify or revise the AIP's determination of responsibility. The instructor of record and department chair of the course shall receive a copy of the determination and sanction.

~~13)~~14) These proceedings should be concluded as expeditiously as possible. The AIPs should strive to have proceedings concluded within four weeks of the report of the violation. However, failure to do so shall not constitute improper procedure under the Code.

Section 5: Sanctions

- a) In each case, the following factors may be considered in determining an appropriate sanction:
- 1) the nature of the violation and the incident itself;
 - 2) the significance of the assignment(s) in question to the academic course or program;
 - ~~2)~~3) evidence of intentionality or lack thereof by the respondent in committing the violation;
 - ~~3)~~4) the impact or implications of the conduct on the University community and its learning environments;
 - ~~4)~~5) prior misconduct by the respondent, including the respondent's relevant prior academic integrity or behavioral misconduct history or lack thereof, both at the University and elsewhere;
 - ~~5)~~6) maintenance of an environment conducive to the integrity of learning and knowledge;
 - ~~6)~~7) protection of the University community;
 - ~~7)~~8) necessary outcomes in order to eliminate the prohibited conduct, prevent its recurrence, and remedy its effects on members of the University community; and,
 - ~~8)~~9) any mitigating, aggravating, or compelling circumstances in order to reach a just and appropriate resolution in each case, including the respondent's demonstration of the understanding and impact of the violation.
- b) Possible sanctions include, but are not limited to, the following:
- 1) educational sanctions intended to improve the respondent's understanding and implementation of academic integrity. This may be assigned in combination with any other sanction. If the respondent fails to complete these sanctions, a registration hold may be placed on their student account.
 - 2) reduction in academic credit for the assignment or course.
 - 3) failure of assignment (generally recommended for first violation).
 - 4) failure of course, including a transcript notation until graduation and successful petition for removal (generally recommended for second violations or egregious first violations).

- 5) suspension from the University for a specified period of time, including a transcript notation until seven years from the date of the incident and successful petition for removal. Suspension may include requirements the student will need to complete in order to return or upon return.
 - 6) expulsion (permanent removal from the University), including a permanent transcript notation.
- c) Neither suspensions nor expulsions may be imposed through an Academic Integrity Agreement.
 - d) Transcript notations for failure of course or suspensions may be removed upon expiration of the dates set forth above and only after successful petition of the respondent to the Provost or designee.
 - e) Records shall be maintained and released by the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities in accordance with University policy and applicable law.
 - f) Following graduation or removal of transcript notation, whichever is later, the respondent's record will be transferred to an administrative archive status and therefore become internal and administrative (i.e. non-conduct) records. Such files are not part of general third-party releases, even with authorization from the respondent. Such records may be released to third-parties upon specific request of the respondent or as required by law.
 - g) Respondents found in violation of this Code may also be removed from or determined to be ineligible for certain University programs or activities, in accordance with the policies, rules, or eligibility criteria of that program or activity.
 - h) No outcome shall prohibit any program, department, college, or school of the University from retaining records of violations and reporting violations as required by their professional standards. The University may retain, for appropriate administrative purposes, records of all proceedings regarding violations of this Code.
 - i) Sanctions assigned to a respondent found in violation of this Code may also have subsequent ramifications upon their academic standing in an academic course or academic program in accordance with the faculty member's syllabus or in the academic college, school, or department regulations and bylaws.

Section 6: Appeals

- (a) After a decision has been confirmed by the relevant dean or designee, the respondent may file a written petition of appeal with the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities within five (5) business days of the outcome.
- (b) Appeals of the decision of the AIP or of the sanction imposed by the relevant dean or designee may be based only on the following grounds:
 - 1) There was a material deviation from the procedures of this Code that affected the outcome.
 - 2) There is new and relevant information that was unavailable at the time of the proceeding, with reasonable diligence and effort that could materially affect the outcome.

- (c) Appeals will be reviewed by the Provost or a designee. The Provost or a designee will then make a decision on the appeal, based on the appeal petition and the reports of the AIP and the relevant dean or designee. The appeal decision of the Provost will typically be rendered and provided to the instructor of record and the respondent within 10 business days of the appeal materials being received by the Provost.
- (d) The decision of the Provost or designee in connection with the appeal shall be final and conclusive and no further appeals will be permitted. The dean of the respondent's home school at the University shall also receive final notice of the case outcome.

Article IV: Changes and Reports Regarding the Code of Academic Integrity

Section 1: Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity

- (a) Substantial changes to this Code shall be referred to or initiated by the Provost or designee. Changes may also be initiated by either the Faculty Senate or the Student Association. Substantial changes must be approved by a majority vote of both the Faculty Senate and the Student Association.
- (b) The Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students shall coordinate with the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students through the Provost to conduct a review of the Code of Academic Integrity at least once every five years.
- (c) Substantial changes will then be forwarded to the President of the University for confirmation and submission to the Board of Trustees.

Section 2: Reports and Reviews

The Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students or designee shall make an annual report on the work of the UICC to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, the Faculty Senate Educational Policy and Technology Committee, the Student Association Senate Academic Affairs Committee, and the Council of Deans.

Effective July 1, 202~~2~~¹



A RESOLUTION ON PRINCIPLES OF SHARED GOVERNANCE AND RECOMMENDED MECHANISMS FOR STRENGTHENING SHARED GOVERNANCE AT GW (22/13)

- WHEREAS**, On November 19, 2021, the chair of the Board of Trustees (“Board”) convened a Shared Governance Task Force, composed of representatives of the Board, the Administration, and the Faculty; and
- WHEREAS**, the Task Force was charged to propose principles of shared governance endorsed by the Faculty and Administration, to be approved by the Board of Trustees, that reflect the mission, history, and values of the George Washington University; and
- WHEREAS**, consistent with the shared governance principles and roles and responsibilities of the Board, the Administration, and the Faculty, as reflected in the University Charter, the Board Bylaws, the Faculty Code, and the Faculty Organization Plan (“FOP”) (the “governing documents”), the document attached to this resolution (“Statement”) presents shared governance and related communications principles that the Board, the Administration, and the Faculty commit to along with recommended mechanisms to strengthen shared governance at GW; and,
- WHEREAS**, this Statement of Principles references, but does not alter or amend, the University’s current governing documents; and
- WHEREAS**, the purpose of this Statement is to recommend the adoption of these principles and additional mechanisms to strengthen the participation and coordination among the Board, the Administration, and the Faculty and encourage robust and multi-directional communication; and
- WHEREAS**, the additional mechanisms presented in this Statement create promising avenues for mutual respect, trust, and cooperation among the Faculty, Administration, and the Board;
- NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**
1. Endorses the appended document, “Statement” which will be presented to the Board for its final approval in April 2022; and
 2. Recommends that Faculty, Administration, and the Board periodically assess their commitment to shared governance principles, the recommended mechanisms, and operational implementation approaches.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES OF SHARED GOVERNANCE AND RECOMMENDED MECHANISMS TO STRENGTHEN SHARED GOVERNANCE AT THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Introduction

On November 19, 2021, the chair of the Board of Trustees (“Board”) convened a Shared Governance Task Force, composed of representatives of the Board, the Administration, and the Faculty. The Task Force was charged to propose principles of shared governance endorsed by the Faculty and Administration, to be approved by the Board of Trustees, that reflect the mission, history, and values of the George Washington University. Consistent with the shared governance principles and roles and responsibilities of the Board, the Administration, and the Faculty, as reflected in the University Charter, the Board Bylaws, the Faculty Code, and the Faculty Organization Plan (“FOP”) (the “governing documents”), this document (“Statement”) presents shared governance and related communications principles that the Board, the Administration, and the Faculty (“we”) commit to along with recommended mechanisms to strengthen shared governance at GW. This Statement of Principles references, but does not alter or amend, the University’s current governing documents.

Shared governance at the University has come to connote two fundamental principles: (1) providing Faculty with a meaningful role in key decision-making processes as reflected in the governing documents, often through elected representation; and (2) entrusting to the Faculty the primary responsibility for specific areas of decision making relating to University’s academic mission. Our governing documents make clear that there are structures already in place at the University that allow for coordinated participation in shared governance by the Board, Administration, and Faculty. However, in view of the “future aspirations of GW while reflecting the mission, history, and values of the university¹”, the purpose of this Statement is to recommend the adoption of these principles and additional mechanisms to strengthen the participation and coordination among the Board, the Administration, and the Faculty and encourage robust and multi-directional communication.

Statement of Shared Governance Principles

The following statement of shared governance principles is intended to provide the Board, the Administration, and the Faculty with the tools and guidance to more effectively and appropriately implement shared governance at the University.

Commitment to Shared Governance. We are committed to the principles of shared governance, as outlined in the University’s governing documents and this Statement to achieve excellence in our academic mission.

Board Delegation of Authority to the Administration. We recognize that the Board is vested with the ultimate legal and fiduciary responsibility for the affairs of the University and in the

¹ The official charge of the Shared Governance Taskforce. Available at: <https://trustees.gwu.edu/shared-governance-task-force>

exercise of that authority understand that it has delegated to the Administration the responsibility to manage the day-to-day affairs of the University. In that regard, we recognize that governance is not management and that the Administration must have the ability to discharge its management responsibilities, with appropriate oversight from the Board and participation of the faculty as described in the governing documents, understanding that mechanisms will be in place to hold the Administration accountable for its actions.

Board Delegation of Authority to the Faculty. We recognize that the Board has delegated to the Faculty primary but not exclusive responsibility for academic matters identified in the Faculty Code, and the FOP.

Recognition of the Faculty Senate and Faculty Assembly. We recognize that the Board, through its adoption of the FOP, and the Administration acknowledge that the Faculty has two faculty bodies – the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Assembly – that serve as the principal mechanisms through which the Faculty participate in shared governance.

We recognize the role of the Faculty Senate and its committees to advise the President and Provost on matters affecting the academic mission and educational policies of the University, and to ensure faculty participation in University-level shared governance, as set forth in the Faculty Code, FOP, and this Statement.

The Administration as the Primary Conduit of Communication Between the Board and Faculty. We recognize, based on the delegation of responsibilities from the Board to the Administration, that shared governance has its greatest meaning not in the relationship of the Faculty to the Board, but in the Faculty’s relationship with the University President and the Administration. We are committed through this principle to maintaining a relationship of collaboration, trust, and mutual respect between the Faculty and the Administration, understanding that there must also be a relationship of trust and mutual respect between the Faculty and the Board. In addition, we recognize that the Administration is not the exclusive conduit for communication between the Faculty and the Board, and that there will be specific mechanisms for communication between the Board and the Faculty, as described in this Statement.

Education and Understanding. We are committed to promoting ways to increase the understanding by the Faculty of the role and responsibilities of the Board, and the understanding by the Board of the role and responsibilities of the Faculty. This may be accomplished through education and training of the Board, Administration, and the Faculty at initial orientation and at other appropriate times, and opportunities for informal gatherings between faculty members and Board members as described in the Statement of Communications Principles below.

Effective Communication. We are committed to developing and maintaining effective and appropriate communication, as set forth in the Statement of Communications Principles below.

Transparency. We are committed to transparency in institutional decision-making and managing the university. We encourage an environment that allows for free exchange of ideas and candid discourse for everyone on campus and those serving on institutional governance bodies and committees. At the same time, we recognize that there may be legal or business reasons why certain

information may not be shared, for example, on personnel matters or competitively sensitive issues, and as referenced earlier, that governance is not management.

Excellence. We are committed to excellence in all that we do, and we will carry out our responsibilities and our interactions in a way that promotes excellence.

Flexibility. We understand that there may be occasions where decisions directly affecting the academic enterprise of the University need to be made more quickly and in a way that may not allow for an extended consultative process. We recognize this need for flexibility and agility but are committed to seeking input appropriate under the circumstances, consistent with the Faculty Organization Plan (e.g., expedited consultation with members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate).

Recommended Mechanisms to Strengthen Shared Governance

The following recommended mechanisms are intended to enhance the above principles in creating and maintaining a relationship of collaboration, trust, and mutual respect between the Faculty, Board, and Administration.

1. The Board will meet with members of FSEC at least twice per year to discuss university-wide issues of interest. The President shall work collaboratively with members of FSEC to provide a structured agenda for these meetings.
2. The Board shall evaluate the President annually and shall conduct a periodic 360-degree review of the President that shall include an evaluation of the President's commitment and adherence to shared governance. Input from all stakeholders (including faculty) will be integral part of this 360-degree review process. With the President's consent, the Board shall provide the FSEC a confidential general summary of the 360-degree review on the issue of adherence and commitment to shared governance.
3. We realize that shared governance is an ongoing process. Hence, we shall hold ourselves accountable for effective evaluation, continuous improvement, and ensuring we stay responsive to our environmental needs. To that end, we shall work collaboratively to conduct a periodic (possibly every 2-3 years) campus climate and shared governance survey, to be overseen by the Administration. We also commit to periodic revisitation of operational implementation approaches as necessary.

Statement of Communications Principles and Recommendations

The following statement of communications principles and recommendations is intended to provide the Board, Administration, and Faculty with the tools and guidance to enhance communication critical to effective shared governance at the University.

1. **Orientation:** The 2022 Shared Governance Survey identified the need for Faculty, Administration, and the Board to educate each other about respective roles, structures, concerns, and culture. **We recommend that the faculty, administration, and trustees should be provided with appropriate orientation and onboarding experiences.** This should involve all parties and specifically address the principles and aspirations for shared

governance, identification of the key roles and responsibilities of the faculty, administration, and the board, the existing structures and mechanisms for governance and management, the key governing documents, and academic mission for the University. The overall purpose of this orientation and onboarding will be to foster an institutional culture of goodwill, trust, and collaboration.

2. **Strategic Context and the Academic Mission:** Decisions at the University are made within a dynamic strategic context that advances its academic mission. The 2022 Shared Governance Survey identified the following challenges affecting higher education: access, affordability and funding, enrollment challenges (changing population, quality, international students), attracting and retaining high-quality faculty, corporatization of universities, faculty burn-out, maintaining and building trust, value proposition and delivering academic excellence, budget and high costs, and size of administration. **We recommend that the President, Provost, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee work collaboratively with the faculty, administration, and the trustees to identify and address critical challenges and opportunities facing the University.** The Faculty, Administration, and Board should be operating with a common awareness of the challenges and constraints facing the University and its key decision-makers.
3. **Forms and Methods of Communications:** To build effective engagement between the Administration and Faculty, consistent and multi-directional communication is essential. **We recommend that the Administration and Faculty Senate, should collaboratively identify additional key mechanisms, frequency, and methods for its communication and engagement with each other.** The President is accountable to both the Board and the Faculty to have robust engagement with faculty to assure that the university's resources are focused optimally on the education, research, and patient care missions. The President is also responsible for bringing forward to the Board, faculty issues/problems and exciting opportunities for strengthening the quality and impact of the academic mission.
4. **Enhancing and promoting the George Washington University Brand/ Reputation:** The Faculty, Administration, and the Board make a deliberate choice to be a part of the institution. It is incumbent on all parties to continue to enhance the University's brand/ reputation for academic excellence and scholarship. Strengthening the image and elevating the reputation of the University as a center of academic excellence and scholarship are of vital importance to successfully engage and attract students, alumni, staff, faculty, and other stakeholders. This understanding shall not be construed to impair or otherwise affect the academic freedom of faculty members guaranteed by Article II of the Faculty Code and the University's Guidelines on Academic Freedom.

Conclusion

The GW governing documents establish shared governance mechanisms that include a significant role for the Faculty, especially on issues relating to the academic enterprise. The additional mechanisms presented in this Statement build on this foundation and create promising avenues for mutual respect, trust, and cooperation among the Faculty, Administration, and the Board.



Faculty Senate

April 8, 2022

Nominees for Approval by the Faculty Senate

2022-2023 Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)

CCAS: Harald Griesshammer

ESIA: Ilana Feldman¹

GSEHD: Sylvia Marotta-Walters

GWSB: Patrick McHugh

GWSPH: Jim Tielsch, Chair

LAW: Jeff Gutman

SEAS: Kim Roddis

SMHS: Robert Zeman

SON: Linda Briggs

2022-2023 Faculty Senate Parliamentarian

Sarah Binder, CCAS

2022-2023 Dispute Resolution Committee Chair

Joan Schaffner, Law School

¹ Due to Professor Feldman's research leave in Fall 2022, the Elliott School will hold a special election on April 15 for a faculty member to serve in her place for the Fall 2022 term. Following the election, the Elliott School Senate members will determine who will be nominated to serve in Professor Feldman's FSEC seat for the Fall 2022 term. The Senate will confirm this nominee at its May 2022 meeting; Professor Feldman will assume her Senate and FSEC seats with the Spring 2023 term.



FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS, SALARY, AND PROMOTION POLICIES (Including Fringe Benefits) (ASPP) Annual Report (2021-2022)

The ASPP committee was very busy this year, including the summer months of 2021. We met 7 times during August 2021- March 2022 period and attended meetings of several other committees as needed. We worked on the following issues, on some of which we had reported in our interim report in December 2021:

Summer 2021: Professor Wirtz served the committee this summer on an interim chair basis and reported to Faculty Senate on August 10 on seven areas in which ASPP was active this summer:

1. Reviewed and provided feedback for the Post-COVID Academic Innovation Task Force Report;
2. Met with and advised the administration regarding the “Phased Plan for Fall 2020” report;
3. Provided feedback to President LeBlanc regarding criteria and possible candidates for the Interim Provost position;
4. Reviewed the proposed guidance from administration regarding the timing of salary increases for Faculty who are compensated on a 9-month basis;
5. Participated (as Interim Chair) in a meeting to discuss health protocols and student accommodations;
6. Reviewed and offered comments on a near-final draft of the “Classroom Protocols” document; and
7. Engaged in ongoing email discussions about Fall teaching issues, such as mask enforcement in learning spaces.

New Salaries: We noted at the August meeting that the new salaries have been put in place, to be effective with the September checks. We also noted that the summer salary for continuing faculty is based on their previous year’s salary and these summer salaries showed no increments.

Classroom Protocols: We discussed the classroom protocols and what to do with students who are not masked. Suggestions were made that the faculty carry a few spare masks with them to classes and offer to the students who are not masked (the masks are available in dean’s and department offices). It was also noted that the faculty should record their lectures, wear a microphone in class, and can remove their masks while lecturing if they are at least 6 feet away from the students and all students are masked. Also noted that eating and drinking is not allowed in GW classrooms.

Faculty Workstation Initiative (FWI): We had a discussion on the Faculty Workstation Initiative (FWI) and the long wait for the new workstations for faculty. The graduate students need newer and better computers, and these are generally passed down from the faculty. The members thought that the Educational Policy & Technology committee should take up the issue of computers for graduate students.

DEI (Diversity, Equity and Inclusion) issues: We have discussed the DEI since last year. The provost has established a diversity leadership council (DLC) which is starting to collaboratively determine areas of focus and collect appropriate data.

Interim President: There was an announcement of the interim president at the September 10 meeting of faculty senate where BOT Chair, Grace Speights, announced that the board had decided to pause the presidential search process and decided to bring in an interim president, Mark Wrighton, on January 1 and also that President LeBlanc will retire as of December 31, 2021. (Everyone applauded the choice of president Wrighton as interim president.)

This announcement from the Board came as a surprise to everyone. It was noted that the Board Chair stated that she supports shared governance but in the next breath she also made these announcements which lacked any consultation with faculty. We were told that FSEC Chair, Arthur Wilson, has written to the Board indicating that level of concern of the faculty who are unhappy with the process where the faculty were completely excluded from the deliberations.

Shared governance survey: A draft from FSEC was circulated to the committee members and comments were invited. Shaista Khilji talked about the process moving forward. She pointed out that the document originated from the Board and AGB. This document has to be customized for GW. The draft document has been authored by Khilji and Arthur Wilson. Several questions are: who conducts the survey, how do you define the term “faculty”, when do the town halls take place, and what are the trustees looking for? Shared governance survey V2.0 should provide clarity to these and other questions. Provost Bracey stated that the trustees very much hope that the survey results will be available prior to the start of the presidential search which starts in the spring. It is important to conduct the town halls before the survey is sent out; this would allow the perspectives of every faculty member to be heard and possibly incorporated into the survey.

Faculty consultative committee on presidential searches: FSEC asked us to work with the Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) committee to update and codify the procedures around appointing the Faculty Consultative Committee that works with presidential search processes; this work would apply to future searches, not the current search that will begin in spring 2022. The ASPP/PEAF subcommittee drafted a resolution that was submitted to faculty senate for its consideration.

Our resolution (22/6) came up for discussion at the Faculty Senate meeting on March 4, 2022, and after a bit of debate, this resolution was tabled. The arguments were that the issues being considered in the resolution were going to be relevant for a presidential search in 5 or 10 years and we don't know how many schools GW will have, and what GW will look like. It was noted that the currently elected Faculty Consultative Committee is already in place with Professor Kim Roddis elected as Chair of FCC. This group will assist in drafting the job description for the next presidential search that will start sometime in spring of 2022.

Post Covid Task Force report: This report was discussed at one of our meetings and the Hatchet had an article on the report. It was noted that being on campus in person is so much better for faculty and students alike. Question was asked: what is going to happen to the recommendations of the task force. Provost Bracey said that the report has been posted on the provosts' web page and

they are taking it under advisement. Students are asking access to course recordings. When asked if many faculty asked to teach remotely for this fall semester, we learned that the number is very small. **COLA:** We considered the issue of cost of living adjustment (COLA), determined that everyone at GW gets a merit raise only and we are not sure if the faculty should receive it just for “sitting in their seats”. We also noted that merit needs to include non-publishing activities undertaken by the faculty, including teaching and advising. A suggestion was made to work with the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee to study this matter, but this didn’t go anywhere.

Faculty salary equity issues: Provost Bracey gave the faculty senate a complete report in February. He told the committee that the methodology has not changed, and they were looking for outliers based on 2021 salary data. In CCAS, 37 outliers were identified with 7 adjustments. In ESIA, 7 outliers were identified with 5 adjustments. In the law school, 4 outliers were identified with 2 adjustments. In GWSB, there were 7 outliers with 2 adjustments. In GSHED, there were 5 outliers with 3 adjustments. In SEAS, there were 8 outliers with 1 adjustment. In SON, there were 5 outliers with no adjustments. In SPH, there were 15 outliers with 3 adjustments. Provost Bracey clarified that an outlier is defined as the salary that is one standard deviation or more away from the regression line. Once a person is identified as an outlier, conversations are held with the deans. This process will be continued moving forward.

Provost Bracey said he wants to reconstitute the salary equity committee and also include race and gender equity, and also possibly include the health science faculty in SMHS.

75%/25% dichotomy on the faculty numbers: We discussed issues of full-time regular faculty where the Faculty Code specifies 75%/25% for regular faculty. That excludes the specialized faculty who do not do all three aspects of regular faculty. According to the Core Indicators data, presented by the Provost in February, the university is very close to 75% for regular tenure track/tenured faculty (75.2% in 2018, 74.8% in 2019 and 74.1% in 2020). However, when all faculty are included (regular, research and specialized), these numbers are much smaller (65.3% in 2018, 63.9% in 2019, and 64.2% in 2020). The university is technically not in violation of the Code as the Code only refers to the regular faculty (with nonzero responsibilities in teaching, research and service), and the university has been getting around this 75/25 issue by hiring more and more specialized faculty. As the number of specialized faculty has grown substantially in the recent years, we decided that this issue needs to be revisited. An ASPP/PEAF subcommittee worked on this matter.

The ASPP/PEAF subcommittee on 75/25 matters had access to the Faculty Dashboard that contains data on faculty; this data can be compiled in multiple ways. It is concluded that GW has been close to the 75% level of regular faculty until recently. The 10-year data on the dashboard shows the percentage of regular faculty to be 75% or above in the seven years before 2019; in 2019 it was 74.8, in 2020 it was 74.1, and in 2021 it was 73.5.

The following link for the dashboard can be accessed through VPN from off-campus computers.

https://insight.it.gwu.edu/views/FacultyDashboard_0/TenureStatus?iframeSizedToWindow=true&%3Aembed=y&%3Adisplay_count=n&%3AshowAppBanner=false&%3Aorigin=viz_share_link&%3AshowVizHome=n#1

The subcommittee reached the conclusion that this is not the time politically to pursue this issue. We need to keep watching and insisting that the administration respects and follows 75/25 rule as it

applies to 'regular' faculty. The subcommittee decided to not broaden the definition even though that might have to be done in the future.

Health care costs: In June 2021, we received a summer update from the **benefits advisory committee** (BAC). The health care costs in 2021 were on a favorable track and the total health insurance premiums for 2022 were projected to increase by 2.9% next year. The participant contributions will increase by 1%, approximately \$1 to \$7 per month depending upon the coverage tier and salary band of the employee. The university's share of health care premiums in 2022 will increase from 76% to 76.8%.

ASPP committee was approached with certain **concerns from CCAS faculty**. One of these issues was the promotion of specialized faculty with the complaint that some faculty without terminal degree could not be promoted. It was suggested that the group looking into revisions of the Faculty Code should look into the rights and privileges of specialized faculty. Here are the concerns of CCAS faculty and the ASPP committee responses:

1. **Promotion for specialized faculty:** It turns out that CCAS now has written guidelines for promotion of specialized faculty in CCAS Bylaws. As far as requirement of a terminal degree is concerned, that may be a departmental matter. I did hear that in another school, a doctoral degree has been required for promotion even when the profession's terminal degree has been obtained by the candidate.
2. Concern about **performance evaluation:** We all have the opportunity to respond to the chair's comments.
3. **Comments on pay/salaries:**
 - a. Effect of inflation is real and we will try to see if a cost of living adjustment (COLA) is worth considering. So far at GW, it is only the merit raises for everyone.
 - b. Lower salaries for humanities is sadly a fact of life.
 - c. Provost's annual salary reports include all faculty.
 - d. Tenure track faculty have a time limit on their probationary period and their clock was adjusted for pandemic. Contract faculty have no such clock.

Respectfully Submitted,
Murli M. Gupta, Chair, ASPP Committee
March 31, 2022

2021-2022 Committee Roster

- [Murli Gupta](#), Chair (CCAS)*
- [Susan LeLacheur](#), Co-chair (SMHS)
- Shaista Khilji, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison (GSEHD)*
- Eugene Abravanel (Emeritus)
- Elizabeth Anker (CCAS)
- Brian Biles (Emeritus)
- Christopher Bracey (Provost)**
- Linda Briggs (SON)*
- Joseph Cordes (CCAS)*
- Wendy Ellis (GWSPH)
- Valentina Harizanov (CCAS)

- Carol Hayes (CCAS)
- Natalie Houghtby-Haddon (CPS)
- Vivek Jain (SMHS)
- Scott Kieff (LAW)*
- Frank Lee (CCAS)
- Jovawn McNeil (GWSA)**
- Sabrina Minor (Interim Chief People Officer)**
- Harris Mylonas (ESIA)*
- Arlene Pericak (SON)
- Pradeep Rau (GWSB)
- Julia Storberg-Walker (GSEHD)
- Abe Tekleselassie (GSEHD)*
- Amita Vyas (GWSPH)*
- Sarah Wagner (CCAS)*
- Phil Wirtz (GWSB)*
- Heather Young (GWSPH)
- Mona Zaghoul (SEAS)

*Senate member

**Non-voting member



Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate Standing Committee on Physical Facilities Annual Report 2021-2022

Submitted by Co-Chairs: Sylvia Marotta-Walters, Chair, Department of Counseling and Human Development & Professor of Counseling and Human Development (GSEHD) and John Traub, Assistant Professor of Production Management & Technology (CCAS)

Committee Members:

Robert Zeman, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison (SMHS)

Elizabeth Amundson, Registrar, Non-voting

Catherine Cox (SON)

Baxter Goodly (Assoc. VP for Facilities Planning, Construction, and Management), Non-voting

Scott Burnotes (VP for Safety and Facilities)

Eric Grynawski (CCAS)

Dhinu Jayaseelan (SMHS)

Joshua Mannix (SON)

James Mahshie (CCAS)

Terry Murphy (Sr. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs)

Isabella Nienaman (GWSA)

Cara Padovano (SON)

Yuan Rao (SMHS)

Mark Reeves (CCAS)

Cynthia Rohrbeck (CCAS)

John Traub (CCAS), Co-chair

Nicholas Vonortas (ESIA)

Colin Young (SMHS)

Sylvia A. Marotta-Walters (GSEHD), Chair

Committee Meeting Dates: August 19, 2021; September 28, 2021; October 1, 2021; October 26, 2021; November 23, 2021; January 4, 2022; January 25, 2022; February 2, 2022; March 22, 2022 (Cancelled);
Next Meeting: April 19, 2022

Campus Spaces Meetings attended by two PFC Members on behalf of Committee: May 3 and 5, 2021; May 10 and 12, 2021; May 17, 2021; May 24, 2021; June 7 2021, June 14, 2021; June 21, 2021; July 12, 2021; July 19,2021; July 26, 2021.

Fiscal Planning and Budget Committee Meetings attended by Chair on behalf of Committee: May 21, 2021; September 24, 2021; October 22, 2021.

H-Street Redesign Committee attended by Chair on behalf of the Committee: 10/29/2021; 11/16/2021;

11/24/2021; 2/16/2022

Topics Covered in Interim Report December 2021 (Details available on Senate Website Interim Report)

HVAC Alignment Scorecard – Building Level

Filtration (HEPA and MERV 13) in residential and classroom buildings

Strategic Campus Facilities Master Plan (SCFMP)

H Street Redesign

Spring Topics and Actions Taken

Return to Campus Spring 2022.

VP Scott Burnotes briefed the committee on testing challenges during the break and decision to start the semester virtually. Waits at the testing centers were longer because of the weather and COVID-19 related absences. The appearance of the Omicron variant required quick actions, including accelerating the booster deadline and creating procedures for residential students to quarantine upon arrival.

The administration ordered 25,000 N95 masks which were to be distributed at testing centers.

Anticipating increased test positivity upon students' return, the administration entered into an agreement with a local hotel to provide increased housing capability should it be needed. Arrangements for isolation in residential halls were also described where this is possible. Approximately 150 singles and 250 doubles are available for isolation purposes.

The administration reported that DC guidelines for a 10 day isolation remain in place even though the CDC changed its policy to five days. A Clear Health App is being discussed to provide instant access to vaccination status.

The committee's questions to the administration included how to access N95 masks, prioritization, checking for fit of small, medium, or large masks for use in laboratories. The committee also requested a definition of who is considered a visitor with access to campus buildings. The committee discussed whether students might be sent home as was done in the prior year (no plans for this) and whether there will be service reductions should staff test positive and need to isolate.

Update on buildings

The HVAC Alignment chart, reported on last fall, was updated with latest figures as of January 24, 2022. The committee questioned whether the repair tickets that were closed actually solved the issue that was reported. Currently this level of data is not available, though the system is being upgraded to provide such. A large remediation project was completed at Amsterdam Hall over the winter break.

General services RFP

Three vendors are currently in consideration: ABM, Aramark, and The Donohoe Companies. Three other vendors have been eliminated already. The goal is to select one in mid to late April.

New Zone Structure for Maintenance

There is an issue regarding work being done by external contractors rather than in-house, though this is being managed with a new system using zones across the university. Facilities are on a zone structure now instead of a shop structure, e.g., plumbing, electric. Now geography drives the needs, shops are across each zone, with a zone manager. The zone manager is responsible for quality control in their area. This includes monitoring of vendor work. Zones were implemented in the fall. Each zone is being monitored by a zone manager who is a GW employee. A report will be made to the committee next month.

The administration reported at a subsequent meeting that a third shift was added for maintenance crews, also working through the zone structure. Interdisciplinary training is beginning in conjunction with Prince George's Community College. A PowerPoint presentation was provided to the committee by Baxter Goodly. Zone maintenance will include self-generated work orders from maintenance personnel who know the buildings in their zone. It will no longer be necessary to wait for others to generate reports. This system brings the work closer to the maintenance staff. The committee had questions about oversight of the maintenance work, how much expertise will reside in GW employees and not only with external contractors, and how resources are distributed across the zones. Baxter reported that each zone team has long time GW employees as well as new hires.

Provisions are in place for cross-training of staff rather than single job roles like plumbing, etc. in favor of general maintenance workers.

H Street Design

The design competition has begun and there are three vendors invited to submit. The committee will be kept apprised of the process as it unfolds. Currently, two vendors are providing responses to the design committee.

Update on classroom level data

John Traub is working with the administration to create an alignment scorecard similar to the building level one that is already in place. He will be completing the list of classrooms, and the administration will provide updated data as projects are initiated and completed. A question was raised about lecture capture camera upgrades in classrooms. This question was referred to the Educational Policy and Technology committee of the Senate.

Upper Room Germicidal Ultraviolet (GUV) in classrooms

A new technology is being investigated by the administration to help with indoor air quality in buildings. The committee decided to create a subcommittee to meet with the proposed vendor. The subcommittee has met twice and will be testing several pieces of equipment in identical classrooms with heavy usage in late spring and summer courses. The data acquired through the testing process will be used to determine any further action on this new technology.