



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SENATE MEETING
HELD ON JANUARY 13, 2023
HYBRID: 1957 E STREET/STATE ROOM & WEBEX**

- Present: President Wrighton, Provost Bracey; Parliamentarian Binder; Acting Registrar Cloud; Senate Office Staff Liz Carlson and Jenna Chaojareon; Deans Ayres, Bass, Fu, Goldman, Henry, Lach, Matthew, and Mehrotra; Professors Anenberg, Bamford, Borum, Briggs, Callier, Clarke, Cordes, Eakle, El-Ghazawi, Feldman, Gore, Griesshammer, Grynawski, Gupta, Gutman, Johnson, Joubin, Kay, Kieff, Kulp, Marotta-Walters, Mazhari, McHugh, Mylonas, Olesen, Orti, Roddis, Sarkar, Schultheiss, Schwindt, von Barghahn, Vyas, Wilson, Wirtz, Yezer, and Zeman.
- Absent: Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair Tielsch; Deans Feuer, Riddle, and Wahlbeck; Professors Pittman and Vonortas.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:00p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The [minutes](#) of the December 9, 2022, Faculty Senate meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Mark Wrighton, President)

The President opened his report by noting that he met recently with approximately 300 newly-admitted students and enjoyed talking with them about GW.

GW will celebrate the life and contributions of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.; campus events include the [MLK Day of Service and Leadership](#) event at Lisner Hall on Monday, January 16.

President Wrighton noted the arrival of the new School of Nursing Dean, Mei Fu; Provost Bracey will introduce her to the Senate at today's meeting.

Very exciting news this week, he noted, is the Board's announcement of GW's next president, Dr. Ellen Granberg, who will take up her responsibilities on July 1, 2023. President Wrighton relayed that he enjoyed the opportunity to visit with her and others on the leadership team and that all are very excited for a smooth and effective transition. The new president met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) and with the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) in a late meeting

on the day of the announcement. He appreciated the faculty who were able to participate, adding that they asked very good questions. He expressed his confidence that President Granberg will be a very effective leader, noting that the Board executed a comprehensive and full process and that the search committee—on which Professor Tielsch served as Vice Chair—did an excellent job. The outcome this week is indicative of a good process. President Wrighton added that the 1925 F Street residence will be available to Dr. Granberg and her wife fully in time for the July 1 transition.

He added that he will remain president of GW until midnight on June 30 and that he intends to continue to be an active leader performing to best of his ability to advance the university. Toward this end, the university needs to focus on recruiting outstanding students. Lasts year's admitted class was the strongest on record, and Vice Provost Goff is optimistic that this year's applicant pool is at least as strong as last year's. In addition, there are a number of faculty searches underway, and the President expressed his support for a robust recruitment cycle. He added that fiscal planning for FY24 is well underway, and noted his commitment to have a good plan in place for the new president.

President Wrighton hoped that Senate members had time for rest and refreshment over the winter break. In looking ahead to a great spring semester, the community must still be mindful of infectious diseases. To that end, the university will require masks in classrooms this semester; he thanked everyone for their cooperation on this matter.

The President offered the following remarks on a recent and troubling issue:

“We have received some media reports that an advocacy organization has submitted a letter to the U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights (OCR). This letter that has been submitted makes claims of discrimination and retaliation against unnamed students in a GW course.

“In such matters, it is critical to thoroughly examine all information from the individuals involved. We are committed to conducting such a thorough examination through a review by a third party. As such, it is not prudent at this time to comment on specific allegations; however, I want to be clear that we reaffirm that the George Washington University strongly condemns antisemitism and hatred, discrimination, and bias in all forms. We remain committed to fostering a welcoming and inclusive environment where all feel safe and free of harassment, hostility or marginalization.

“We care deeply about the wellbeing of all members of our community and their experiences inside and outside our classrooms, and we recognize it is critical to provide several avenues for support to those who may be seeking it. The university will continue to provide support to students and faculty who have shared concerns about recent experiences and work with those involved to take appropriate actions to address these concerns. Resources and complaint mechanisms are available through the Office for Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement; Division for Student Affairs; Faculty Affairs; and Employee Relations. The university also recognizes and supports academic freedom, and the right of all members of our community to speak out on issues of public concern, understanding that they are not speaking on behalf of the university.

“Finally, as I have stated in the past, I want to emphasize that we are all part of a shared community that values diversity, inclusion, and freedom of expression, and these values may at times feel in conflict with each other. In encouraging discourse on difficult topics, we must remember the importance of civility, respect, and empathy. Our community is made stronger by everyone’s unique experiences and backgrounds. We are grateful for our community’s leadership in examining our thinking, understanding, and interactions with one another to lead meaningful and productive discussions that have a positive impact on others.”

The president noted that this is a difficult time as the university is facing a great deal of media interest but that he is not in a position to speak further about this matter while the third-party review is underway.

Finally, the President reported that the Board has been active and working hard on consideration of their stated priority of enhancing academic medicine. In this vein, the Board has held two full board meetings about one month apart focused on discussions of academic medicine and the challenges and opportunities around sustaining a priority in this area. In addition, the Board Executive Committee has also held two regularly scheduled meetings at which they discussed this matter. President Wrighton affirmed that the Board has adopted the recommendation and resolution from the administration to sustain a priority for academic medicine. The President looked forward in his remaining months to continue to work to expand the scope and quality of clinical medicine, biomedical research, and medical education.

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PRESIDENT’S REPORT

Recognizing the sensitivity of the pending investigation described by the President, Professor Wirtz: noted that there were a couple of situations during the fall semester that came close to getting out of hand because of the speed with which information and misinformation were transmitted over social media. As a result, it was difficult to establish and get the word out with regard to the truth of these situations, and this did damage to the reputation of the university as well as some individuals who were severely misquoted. He observed that he is seeing a repeat of this today with social media going wild with speculation and misinformation. The university absolutely needs to get to the bottom of this matter and have all the relevant facts before reaching conclusions, but he worried that GW will again find itself in a situation similar to that of last fall with social media getting ahead of the truth that will come from a thorough review. He hoped the President would encourage the investigating third party to understand the urgency of obtaining all the facts as soon as possible to head off a campaign of misinformation.

President Wrighton thanked Professor Wirtz for his very good comments and indicated that the university will do its best for an expeditious review of this matter.

INTRODUCTION: Mei Fu, Dean, School of Nursing (Chris Bracey, Provost)

Provost Bracey introduced Mei Fu, an internationally recognized nurse scientist, researcher and educator and GW’s new dean of the School of Nursing. She has a wealth of experience in securing funding for impactful research, developing clinical partnerships, supporting faculty, assisting students with their scholarly and career goals, and advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion and health equity for Black, Asian and Hispanic populations.

Dean Fu has held distinguished administrative and faculty roles at New York University; Boston College Connell School of Nursing; and, most recently, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey School of Nursing-Camden. At Rutgers, she was responsible for strengthening research and educational opportunities and developing the school's strategy and path for excellence and growth.

In 2012, Dean Fu was elected as a fellow of the American Academy of Nursing, and she served as the leading co-chair for the academy's Genomic Expert Panel from 2016 to 2019. She was inducted into the International Nurse Researcher Hall of Fame, Sigma Theta Tau International, in 2017. She has received numerous prestigious awards in her field for her leadership, research and mentorship, including from the Oncology Nursing Foundation.

Dean Fu has focused her research on cancer-related symptoms, pain, chronic illnesses, quality of life, and social determinants of health. She has received and managed grants from preeminent organizations including the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation.

She is an extremely valuable addition to the GW community and the provost senior leadership team, and the Provost noted he is looking forward to their work together.

He also thanked Pamela Slaven-Lee for her strong leadership as interim dean of the School of Nursing. As interim dean, she worked tirelessly on behalf of students, faculty, and staff and helped the school continue to advance its mission, and he expressed his gratitude for her partnership. Pamela Slaven-Lee has agreed to remain on the decanal staff as Associate Dean of Academic Affairs to support Dean Fu as she leads the School of Nursing into its next period of growth and development.

Dean Fu noted that the talented faculty and students in the School of Nursing were a major draw for her to GW. She observed the passion of the students, who really want to make a difference in healthcare. She noted that another draw was the strength of multidisciplinary collaborations among GW's schools. She stated that she is humbled and honored to be in service as the third dean of the School of Nursing and is looking forward to working closely with faculty, students, and administration to make GW nursing even stronger.

RESOLUTION 23/5: Regarding the Finances of the GW Medical Faculty Associates (Joe Cordes & Susan Kulp. Co-Chairs, Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee)

Professor Kulp introduced [the resolution](#), which represents a collaborative effort to work together to understand the financial implications of the MFA's situation as the university moves forward with its academic medicine priority. She thanked the President, the Provost, and Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and Treasurer Bruno Fernandes for their support over past few months while discussing this issue, and for conveying the faculty's position with the Board. Professor Cordes agreed that the committee has had very good cooperation from the administration, noting that the Board is certainly now aware of the importance of this issue to the faculty.

President Wrighton affirmed that the Board is now fully up to speed on this matter; in particular, they have had intense discussions among the members of the Finance & Investments committee (led by veteran committee member and trustee Ave Tucker). He added that he is pleased to see this resolution and fully supports the administration's commitment to provide updates on the MFA's

financial circumstances and progress toward its goals. He noted that the MFA Board not in sync with the Board of Trustees; they meet at very different times. As soon as the MFA has concluded their review of their finances and this has been reviewed by both boards, that information will be shared with the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting committee as requested.

Professor Cordes moved consideration of the resolution, and Professor Wirtz seconded.

Professor Wirtz asked a question about the specifics of the university's funding commitment to the MFA. As he understands it, there is currently a line of credit consisting of two components—\$120 million and \$20 million—that the university has committed to the MFA. He asked where there has been any additional commitment on the part of the university to the MFA in addition to that \$140 million. President Wrighton responded in the affirmative, noting that two separate actions were approved by the Board: 1) on December 13, the Board advanced an additional \$15 million to the MFA (as a loan to be repaid); and 2) at its January 12 meeting, the Board embraced a resolution to advance up to an additional \$45 million through the end of FY23.

Professor Wirtz recalled assurances from President LeBlanc two years ago that the MFA would break even and from Dean Bass last May that the MFA was prepared to make good on its commitment to the university “in short order.” There has now been a long series of situations in which the administration (and Professor Wirtz emphasized that this comment was not aimed in any way at President Wrighton) has not been appropriately forthcoming with the Senate or the university as whole with regard to this situation. With the additional \$60 million approved by the Board, the advance is now up to \$200 million; he asked whether the university is close to seeing a break-even point or whether it is throwing good money after bad. He asked whether the President could give his personal assurance (particularly given his strong credibility with the Senate) that, with this additional money, the MFA really will break even this year and is on the path to financial recovery.

President Wrighton responded that the MFA has engaged in a robust planning process; the Board is familiar with this process and believes that the MFA will be at break-even by the end of FY24. However, he noted, the university and the Board understand that there is no guarantee that financial success will be achieved. He noted that the Board has thoroughly considered this and has talked extensively with Dean Bass, Ellen Zane (chair of the MFA Board), Mark Chichester and Pam Lawrence (two current members of the Board who serve on the MFA Board), CFO Fernandes (the President-designated university executive to be the administration's representation on the MFA Board). Through all of these discussions, the Board has been given as much assurance as possible that progress will be made.

Professor Wirtz, noting that the FY24 estimate is not one he had heard before today, asked if there is any idea of where the MFA will stand at the end of FY23. CFO Fernandes responded that, for FY23, a loss of between \$55-65 million on revenue of \$375-400 million is expected. He noted that the run rate will start to decline substantially in the next few months, as most of the loss for FY23 is front-loaded to the beginning part of the fiscal year. Professor Cordes added that, while the amounts weren't known, the CFO did give the sense in an earlier Senate meeting that this was going to be the likely scenario for FY23.

Professor Grynaviski commented that, while attending the event yesterday for GW's new president, he thought about how difficult it would be to come in as a new president without a resolution like the one on the floor today. Dr. Granberg would otherwise be in the position of beginning her tenure

with meetings on a challenging and potentially hostile matter, a situation much like what happened in the September Senate meeting when the faculty learned the state of the MFA finances and that the promises of the past couple of years have not been kept in terms of MFA affordability. This resulted in many faculty being extremely upset over this matter. He expressed his support for the resolution as, otherwise, the new president would be in a difficult place where the first events that she would have to meet about with the faculty would be about another generation of broken promises. The Senate receiving quarterly reports and knowing what is going on in advance will put Dr. Granberg in a much stronger position with respect to the faculty.

He asked what plan B is from the Board, the MFA Board, and the administration if the FY24 forecast does not seem to be bearing out next year. The resolution states that it is essential that GW has the School of Medicine & Health Sciences (SMHS), which is affiliated with GW, but this can mean any number of things. There was an affiliation with the MFA before 2018 in which the university did not have this dramatic exposure to debt; there is a different affiliation today. He asked whether there are strategies (including possible different affiliations) to try and reduce the university's exposure, particularly as it navigates a challenging environment that includes emerging from the pandemic and inflation.

President Wrighton responded that there has been one medical school that closed; the university believes that would be a bad option, but it is a possibility. He expressed his belief that such an action would dramatically diminish GW's prospects as a premier research university and would also be adverse to the community around the campus. GW provides a significant fraction of medical services for a relatively disadvantaged community, and, in two years, the Cedar Hill Regional Medical Center will be a physical and operational reality that will serve an important part of the DC area. The university must look on a regular basis at the prospects for success against the plan, and adjustments may have to be made. A number of possible adjustments exist, ranging from downsizing the range of clinical services provided or assessing and changing different expense categories in order to make sure the organization can be both operationally and financially strong. The university is intimately involved with GW Hospital, and, as they grow, the university will also become stronger. It is important that the hospital affiliation be recognized as a critical component of success. The CEOs of the MFA and the hospital are working very collaboratively, but changing this relationship could also be a component of changes if needed. He noted that there are talented people on both the MFA and full Boards, and Board of Trustees members have acknowledged that they now know a lot more about academic medicine and the situation the university is moving into in this area than they ever knew before.

Professor Johnson suspected that there are many entities at GW that cost more to operate than the income they generate. The MFA is just one of them, and he asked why the MFA is getting this level of scrutiny. He also wondered whether the MFA's financial accounting includes the tuition dollars generated to the medical school from teaching activities, noting that the MFA is intimately involved in medical education at GW. Finally, he asked why annual or biannual reports wouldn't suffice, as opposed to quarterly reports.

President Wrighton noted that both of the traditional operations of a research university—education and research—are done at GW at an operational loss; operational revenue (tuition) does not cover the cost of educating students. Current gifts, prior philanthropy leading to growth in the endowment, and investment returns make up some of the difference. Sponsored research from the federal government and from foundations is inadequate to cover the cost of research projects (this is

true for all institutions). Research universities act as partners to external research funding sources, providing significant funding to make up the shortfall left by federal sponsored research dollars. The shortfall of federal research money is at least 25 cents on the dollar; depending on the nature of the research—the kind of facilities and safety/security issues involved—this shortfall can rise to 50 cents on the dollar. GW, with its significant research portfolio, makes a significant institutional match to the federal and foundation support it receives. The shortfall is then made up from the endowment, current gifts, and any other unrestricted revenue the university enjoys. He noted that both of GW's core operations, like every other research university, are money losers, and, he added, he is not accustomed to spending money he doesn't have. The university will therefore need to expand its endowment and current annual gift support if it wants to expand research.

He added that, when looking at research universities across the country, those who are privileged to have very strong clinical programs in their schools of medicine are typically contributing very significantly to the infrastructure for both education and biomedical research and for renewing the clinical facilities and equipment necessary to remain at the top of their game. He noted that hospitals are critical partners in the clinical realm. GW Hospital needs to thrive; as they do, GW's medical enterprise will also thrive. As the university expands the scope and quality of what it does in this area, the hospital will benefit as well.

In response to Professor Grynawski's question, Professor Cordes noted that the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting committee did spend time talking about whether this particular resolution should refer to a plan B for the MFA should the current plan not maintain a successful track. Ultimately, the committee decided that step one is to get the information, and that is what this resolution does. Obtaining this information will much better inform the kind of conversation happening at today's meeting. As the President noted, the financial health of this particular entity has implications for the rest of the university. Professor Cordes expressed his hope is that the requested updates will show a favorable trajectory; this would be the best possible outcome for everyone. If they don't, then course corrections may need to be considered.

President Wrighton noted that the new partnership with Universal Health Services (UHS) only came into effect on August 22, 2022. By end of this fiscal year, this partnership will still be less than a year old. He anticipated better times ahead fiscally as a result of the renegotiated partnership.

Professor Gupta asked whether education and research are loss leaders for the university in every area, not just medicine. President Wrighton responded that this is indeed the case, adding that the university enjoys an endowment payout of roughly \$100 million annually; this is not operational revenue. Without that, GW would have a negative surplus.

Professor Yezer hoped that the trustees have had the prudence to hire a competent consulting firm to obtain an external opinion about how best to proceed. He observed that the plan will either work or it won't, and he thanked the President for his candor. President Wrighton observed that the resolution introduces more information in real time about whether the objectives that have been set are being realized.

Professor Griesshammer noted that, lest the medical faculty be concerned, no one wants to abandon or abolish the medical enterprise. It is true, however, that at every other university he is aware of, the medical enterprise is significantly adding to university revenue. This is not the case here, and he encouraged his colleagues not to look to other university entities that are not making money for the

university. A more beneficial comparison would be to other medical enterprises and not to other entities at GW. The MFA is not competitive at moment, and this comes at an opportunity cost, impacting the status of buildings, education, faculty recruitment, and other important areas. He is relieved that the MFA Board and the Board of Trustees now appear to be in sync with regard to philosophy if not to their calendar. As recently as a month ago, this did not appear to be the case. That was particularly troubling as there are Board of Trustees members serving on the MFA Board. All board members have a fiduciary responsibility not necessarily to keep a program alive but to either bring it into a working state or shut it down if it cannot be brought to that state. He hoped the MFA Board in particular would take its fiduciary responsibilities more seriously going forward following an extensive period of misinformation to the administration, the Senate, and the university as a whole. The faculty's research into this matter brought to light how difficult the situation actually was. He thanked President Wrighton in particular for helping to take the lead in correcting this, adding that he hoped this matter would not need to remain in the Senate's portfolio forever. Finally, he expressed concern that the MFA Board still takes advice from a previous GW administrator given that this individual was largely responsible for the disastrous rollout in the medical enterprise over the past few years.

President Wrighton noted that he has attended both sets of board meetings, as has Vice President and General Counsel Charles Barber, Vice President, Chief of Staff, and Secretary Aristide Collins, and CFO Fernandes. Trustees Chichester and Lawrence also serve on the MFA Board. There is a great deal of interaction, and he stated his belief that, now, the entire Board of Trustees is up to speed on the risks and opportunities. Their mutual objective is to realize the opportunities, and he hoped that there would be a turn for the positive during the remainder of his time at GW.

Professor Zeman noted that the relationship between other medical schools and their university hospital affiliates is radically different than GW's was prior to August 2022. This will be a positive change in terms of GW's financial relationship with the hospital. President Wrighton agreed that the new arrangement with UHS better positions the university to work toward a greater probability of success for its clinical programs. At this time, UHS and GW objectives are very much aligned.

In recognizing Professor Roddis, the President thanked her for her leadership on the FCC and was glad she was able to attend Wednesday's announcement. Professor Roddis appreciated today's wide-ranging discussion and spoke in favor of the resolution. It is clear, explains the reasons the Senate wants this information, and explains that the Senate is seeking the same normal fiscal information about the MFA as it already receives about the university. It is appropriate to review this information as a separate item because it is accounted for as a separate item on the university's balance sheets. The resolution asks for exactly the information faculty needs to be an informed and useful partner in shared governance. She was also pleased to hear the President state his support for the resolution.

However, she raised a procedural question she hoped the Parliamentarian could address. While it is healthy to have a wide-ranging discussion, there is a particular motion on floor. Today's discussion has aired many points that are related to the bigger question of the medical enterprise but do not directly address the motion on the floor. She asked if the Parliamentarian might help guide comments to focus on support of or opposition to the motion. The Parliamentarian responded that the discussion has thus far been informative to Senate members, and she noted that the decision about closing debate is left to the Senate. However, she suggested that before debate ends, it should be ascertained whether there are any proposed amendments to the resolution.

Professor Wirtz noted that he might have an amendment but required clarification on a point of information first. He asked whether the FY23 forecast numbers anticipate funds from the potential sale of 2300 M Street. CFO Fernandes responded that the FY23 forecast does not include this. Professor Wirtz noted that, in that case, he did not wish to propose an amendment.

Professor Grynawski proposed an amendment to Whereas Clause 1 to strike the words “and its” that are currently placed between “George Washington University” and “medical enterprise.” His reasoning was that there may come a point at which there would need to be a rethinking of the university’s affiliation with the medical enterprise and that no enterprise is so critical that it would impact the success of the university as a whole. Removing these two words would prevent creating a narrative that the medical enterprise is too big to fail and is inevitably forever tied to the university. Professor Yezer added that “Medical Enterprise” should be un-capitalized; this noted as a typographical error. The amendment was seconded and was adopted by unanimous consent.

Professor Johnson proposed an amendment to Resolving Clause 1 to change “quarterly” to “annual.” The amendment was not seconded and failed.

Unanimous consent for the resolution as amended was requested but failed. The resolution as amended passed a show of hands vote with 26 in favor and 1 opposed.

Professor Wirtz offered a closing viewpoint that this is a situation where the faculty and administration seem very much to have been collaborating with one another. He noted that the spirit of the last several months of discussion with the administration on this issue has been a profound climate change, and he thanked President Wrighton for this. The Senate expressed its appreciation with a round of applause, and President Wrighton noted that he would share this applause with the Board of Trustees, who have been very diligent and hardworking in connection with the issues surrounding all of these matters discussed both today and in previous meetings.

REPORT: Shared Governance Next Steps (Professor Shaista Khilji)

Professor Khilji’s report is [attached](#). President Wrighton thanked Professor Khilji for her thorough report and noted, in the interest of shared governance, that FSEC will next meet with the Board Executive Committee on February 23.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No new resolutions were introduced at the meeting.

GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Nominations for Membership to Senate Standing Committees
Professor Jason Zara’s nomination to the Educational Policy & Technology committee was approved by unanimous consent.
- II. Senate Standing Committee Annual Reports Received
The [Libraries](#) committee interim report is included with the minutes and has been posted to the Senate website.

- III. Report of the Executive Committee: FSEC Member Harald Griesshammer
As Professor Tielsch is traveling outside the county and unable to attend today's meeting, Professor Griesshammer delivered the [attached](#) report.
- IV. Provost's Remarks
The Provost's remarks are [attached](#).

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Professor Wilson asked whether the university will issue a statement addressing artificial intelligence (AI) software that can respond to prompts to generate essays so that faculty know what rules apply in the classroom. Provost Bracey responded that, from the conversations he has had thus far with the Academic Integrity staff, the sense is that this falls under the Student Code of Conduct in the general category of cheating (and not plagiarism). Ongoing conversations will determine whether the existing Code already prohibits the use of this new AI software that can respond to a prompt entered by a person to generate an essay on a subject. The university may ultimately issue a statement along these lines to the community, highlighting the fact that, based on the construction of the Code, use of this software in a manner that was not authorized by a faculty member as part of a curriculum may constitute cheating and a violation of the Code. The Provost noted that this issue arose in November and has quickly gotten the attention of students and faculty; he is already aware of a handful of cases where essays using this software were submitted by students for academic credit.

Professor Cordes asked whether this statement might be issued soon so that faculty can tell students what the rules of engagement are around this software.

Professor Schultheiss observed that a lot of campuses are way ahead of GW on this—in particular, the WashU policy is very thoughtful and elaborate and goes well beyond just forbidding the use of the software. She noted that the technology exists and will become more prevalent and will not be free of cost forever, adding an access issue to the overall problem. The university needs a considered and comprehensive approach to this disruptive moment, and she invited colleagues to attend a session on January 18 at 3pm in Gelman 101 to discuss this.

Provost Bracey agreed and noted that this issue goes beyond the classroom and is a consideration for admissions purposes as well. This is a larger academic integrity question, and the university wants to be thoughtful about its response.

Professor El-Ghazawi added that this problem will certainly expand beyond one piece of software. He suggested that identifying cases where software assistance is being used should perhaps be tasked to a committee that can examine cases quickly and render decisions.

Professor Griesshammer noted that the Educational Policy & Technology committee is already looking at this. A proactive approach forbidding the use of this technology is good, as is identifying ways to make cheating more difficult. For example, he noted that AI will not help students in oral exams or in-class essays. Moving in this direction would require a learning curve by faculty and students, but, he noted, it is not enough to forbid use of the technology and try to catch people who are cheating.

The Provost noted that his office does have a holding statement that he plans to distribute next week when classes begin so faculty will have some initial information. Dean Henry will also hold an event for faculty next week so they can learn more about the software and how it functions. These communications and discussions are happening now in anticipation of start of semester, but there will be more to come.

Professor Schultheiss asked that the Senate consider returning to fully in-person meetings and move away from the hybrid format; anyone wishing to wear a mask in person is of course welcome to do so. However, the ideal is being face to face in each other's presence. Professor Roddis noted that a hybrid option needs to be maintained at least through the current Senate session as, when elections were held last year, some faculty were elected who had previously indicated they could only serve on the Senate if a hybrid option was maintained.

Professor Grynawiski noted that, while faculty don't necessarily object to mask mandates in classroom, there is some confusion given that other area universities have not taken a similar stance and have kept masks optional or at the instructor's discretion. He asked what is driving GW's mask mandate in the classrooms and observed that mask compliance in classrooms dropped dramatically last semester and difficult to enforce. President Wrighton responded that the new COVID variant is more transmissible; while the variant does not appear to be generating more severe illness, masks have proven to be very effective in containing the spread of the virus. To this end, the university continues to believe that masks should be used in classroom settings.

Professor Yezer recalled a Senate resolution from the 1990s that supported a 5-year business model and planning cycle. He urged the university to develop such a model, noting that, without this, strategic planning is impossible, and the new president will be hard pressed to lead the development such a plan. President Wrighton noted that each academic unit has been asked to renew a 5-year model for its finances annually, and he agreed that this is a prudent plan. Professor Cordes added that the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting committee plans to take this issue up again. Earlier committee work on this was derailed by the pandemic, but he hoped the committee would be able to work on this with CFO Fernandes going forward.

Finally, President Wrighton noted that the next men's basketball game will take place at 4pm on January 14. GW is playing St. Louis University, and those assembled appreciated that this is a rivalry of great interest for the President.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00pm.



Faculty Senate

A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE FINANCES OF THE GW MEDICAL FACULTY ASSOCIATES (23/5)

WHEREAS, The existence of a financially viable physicians practice that is affiliated with the George Washington School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) is critical to the overall success of the George Washington University medical enterprise;

WHEREAS, The George Washington University Medical Faculty Associates (“MFA”) has experienced serious financial losses in each of the past three fiscal years;

WHEREAS, In order to sustain the financial viability of the MFA, The George Washington University (as the sole member of the MFA) has been compelled to make substantial loans to the MFA and to financially guarantee loans made to the MFA by private creditors;

WHEREAS, Recent GW Medical Center web postings have raised reasonable concerns about the ability of certain SMHS departments to recruit physicians in sufficient numbers to be able to increase the client base;

WHEREAS, Past and continued use of University assets to maintain the financial viability of the MFA requires diverting University resources that would otherwise be used to support the broader academic mission of the University;

WHEREAS, The George Washington University faculty, staff, and students have a vital interest in the success of efforts to stabilize the MFA finances;

WHEREAS, It has been customary in past years for the Faculty Senate to receive quarterly updates about the progress of annual approved University budgets once such budgets have been presented to the George Washington University Board of Trustees;

WHEREAS, Information about finances of the Medical Faculty Associates is currently provide annually but not quarterly;

WHEREAS, Quarterly, as well as annual, updates on finances of the MFA provides useful information on progress made toward stabilizing MFA finances;

WHEREAS, In addition to the information typically included in quarterly budget updates, information about MFA cash flows and debt is particularly relevant in the case of the MFA; and

WHEREAS, Such information is not competitively sensitive;

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

1. That the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee receive quarterly updates on MFA finances that are comparable to those included in quarterly budget updates for the University; and
2. That such updates include analysis of MFA cash flows as well as MFA-related current and anticipated loans from, revolving credit issued by, and credit extended by external creditors which is underwritten by the University;

Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting
January 2, 2023

Adopted as amended by the Faculty Senate
January 13, 2023

Shared Governance: Thoughts/Next Steps
Professor Shaista Khilji
Faculty Senate Report
January 13, 2023

I want to begin by thanking Jim Tielsch for inviting me to return to the Senate to provide a short report “on the shared governance task force results and some thoughts on what’s next in terms of operationalizing this agreement.” Since I already updated the senate on the results of the shared governance in April 2022, I would focus on what should be next and provide some suggestions to the Senate, administration, and the Board to move forward. Before I do so, I would like to be on record with the reminder that the Shared Governance Task Force (SGTF) and this Senate body only approved the Shared Governance Principles document included in the April 2022 Senate minutes. The SGTF did not approve the Summary of Roles and Responsibilities that the Board approved in May 2022. I am glad the correction has been made on the SGTF website.

Now focusing on the future and suggestions, I want to mention that, in the spirit of shared governance and because I no longer serve as a senator, I reached out to several colleagues on the senate and outside to solicit their input. I asked them:

- What gains have we made?
- What challenges do we face?
- What areas do we need to focus on to make substantial progress?

I asked these questions, realizing shared governance is an ongoing process shaped by day-to-day realities. Hence, I frame this update to highlight the current context and how we (as faculty) and the institution can stay responsive and collaborative using principles of shared governance. On page 3 (bullet point 3) of the Shared Governance Principles document, it is stated, “*We shall hold ourselves accountable for effective evaluation, continuous improvement, and ensuring we stay responsive to our environmental needs.*”

We launched the SGTF as a collective effort and with the willingness to adopt collaborative approaches. The Shared Governance 2.0 *recognizes interdependencies of various components (without jeopardizing their independence)*, and the Shared Governance Principles document *encourages transparency and frequent communication to establish a strong foundation of trust.*

The Board

With respect to how the Board fulfilled its end of recommendations proposed in the Shared Governance Principles document: The Board Executive Committee (BoTEC) met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) in the fall semester. It was a welcome addition to the FSEC role. We hope these meetings **continue with a more structured agenda**, as stipulated in the Shared Governance Principles document, that allows FSEC and BoTEC to discuss university-wide issues openly. At the same time, the FSEC chair participated in new faculty and administrator orientations and provided an overview of shared governance. I recently spoke to Emily Hammond, Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, about inviting Board members to both faculty and administrator orientations. We hope that a select few faculty members/FSEC chair are also invited to new trustee orientations in the future.

These are some positive developments. Having said that, as you have heard, the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA) issues continue to cause significant frustration. We hope that we receive necessary and timely updates that allow us to understand GW's financial commitments better.

As I said, we have made good progress on shared governance (compared to where we were a year ago). And moving forward, we should continue to “*create promising avenues for mutual respect, trust, and cooperation among the faculty, admin, and the board*” (I quote that from the SG Principles document: page 4). I propose the following recommendations:

1. **Reiterate the importance of the Board getting to know diverse faculty members from different schools.**
 - For example, in 2022, GW hosted several town halls—those by the SGTF in spring 2022 and then for the presidential search in Fall 2022. I hope the Board agrees with me about how important these town halls have been in building a shared spirit and opening communication channels. Venues like these town halls are also important for the Board to meet ordinary non-FSEC and non-Senate faculty. We should continue with such town halls where the administration, faculty, and the board come together to discuss various ideas and hear each other to understand our motivation and passion for GW.
2. In SGTF, we proposed having 1-2 **faculty observers** on Board committees. While this idea never made it to the Shared Governance Principles document, my colleagues and I want to reiterate the importance of having faculty observers—to build better relationships and an opportunity for bottom-up feedback that is critical for cross-pollinating ideas.
3. I think it is also important that **Board members spend some more time on campus**—and (quite selfishly) for one, we want them to see the status of many of our sub-par facilities so that more resources can be diverted towards upgrading these buildings to acceptable standards before we invest hefty dollars in shiny new walkways and buildings.
4. Having the Board chair provide **annual updates to the faculty followed by Q&A**—I believe the Faculty Assembly or even the Senate can provide such a venue. It would significantly improve communication and the level of trust among us.

The Administration

On behalf of the faculty, I want to thank the current administration for making genuine efforts to communicate regularly. Many faculty members noted that in 2022, we continued to make good progress toward a goal of more transparency.

There are immediate areas of improvement that I would like to highlight:

1. Given that we have been discussing and working on academic priorities, we must further encourage university-wide faculty participation and greater hands-on involvement within different schools.
2. At the same time, if these academic priorities are feeding into strategic priorities, there should be robust faculty involvement and participation—starting with the Senate and its subcommittees (please note that I also include this as a suggestion for the Senate).

I realize we will soon have a new president, who, as she mentioned in her brief introduction to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), brings expertise in strategic planning. We have learned over

the past that the president sets the tone for a collaborative and productive relationship with the faculty (or lack thereof), as well as between the faculty and the Board. I am delighted to welcome Dr. Granberg, who we all hope leads with openness, empathy, and transparency, and works with the faculty collaboratively. So much of this ongoing faculty-administration-trustee relationship will be determined by her style and approach.

The Faculty & the Senate

The faculty (at large) and the Senate (in particular) have an important role in shared governance.

This begins with the **faculty** actively participating in faculty governance. Hence, I want to advocate for broader faculty involvement in institutional planning and operation through Senate standing committees. For my faculty colleagues (who are not in the Senate), I want to emphasize that the Senate standing committees are critical for meaningful faculty governance. Without effective and rigorous faculty involvement, there is no shared governance. With this, I make an appeal to GW faculty to participate in faculty governance actively.

As for the **Senate**:

1. They should find ways of **encouraging greater faculty participation** in various senate standing committees across different schools.
2. The Senate should also consider **developing specific mechanisms and processes that ensure we move beyond shared governance principles**. I pose this suggestion in response to two questions asked of me: What does shared governance mean beyond the principles? What processes should be/are in place to make it a daily reality? I believe that Senate standing committees are well-positioned to play an important role in this regard. Hence,
 - a. **The Senate should engage with the Senate standing committees** and solicit their support to ensure that faculty are not left surprised by major announcements made by the administration at the institutional level. We should work in concert with the administration to ensure we are involved in decisions that impact us. I believe the Educational Policy & Technology (EPT) committee already has a shared governance subcommittee. We should support their work.
 - b. **The Senate and its standing committees could also discuss how shared governance should be facilitated and supported at the school level**. I emphasize this point because when my colleagues and I wrote and presented Shared Governance 2.0 in Sept 2021 and the Shared Governance Principles document in April 2022, we mainly focused on shared governance at the institutional level—that is, the interactions and relationships among the trustees, administration, and the faculty. But as shared governance flexes its muscles and is on the heels of bringing in a new president, it is important also to consider the application of shared governance at the school level. It means strengthening faculty involvement in establishing academic priorities and participating in strategic planning at the school level.
3. The issue of Strategic Planning is an important one. The Shared Governance Principles document (p. 4- bullet point 2- Strategic Context and the Academic Mission) states: "*We recommend that the President, Provost, and FSEC work collaboratively with the faculty, admin, and the trustees to identify and address critical challenges and opportunities facing the University.*" With that in mind, **the Senate should consider establishing a Special Committee or Taskforce on Strategic Planning** to get a head start. This would allow the faculty to work with the

administration and the board (at an opportune time) to get clarity on the timing, creation, and implementation of a strategic plan. Starting this process earlier is critical to ensuring our voice is incorporated as GW considers its future vision and, most importantly, avoid major surprises.

I conclude with the statement I started with, “Shared governance is an ongoing process.” It is a journey and not a destination. Yes, we have made good strides in one year. I want to thank President Wrighton for his authentic and forward-looking leadership and Provost Bracey for his dedication and commitment to GW. We are very grateful for your collaborative spirit.

In conclusion, I believe that we have had a good start, and we should keep the momentum. Now that we have established the Shared Governance principles, it is time to think about the processes and specific mechanisms to move GW forward. I expect this Senate to play a vital role.

Thank you!



Faculty Senate

Standing Committee on Libraries (FSLC) Interim Report 2022-2023

Presented by Rhonda Schwindt and Holly Dugan

Members of the committee:

<i>Schwindt, Rhonda*</i> , <i>Chair</i>	SON	Voting
<i>Dugan, Holly</i> , <i>Co-Chair</i>	CCAS	Voting
<i>Agnew, Hugh*</i> , <i>FSEC Liaison</i>	ESIA	Voting
Abate, Laura	Himmelfarb	Nonvoting
Eakle, Jonathan*	GSEHD	Voting
Echevarria, Mercedes	SON	Voting
Faraz, Asefeh	SON	Voting
Henry, Geneva	LAI	Nonvoting
Joubin, Alexa Alice*	CCAS	Voting
McGuire-Kuletz, Maureen	GSEHD	Voting
Pagel, Scott	Law Library	Nonvoting
Patel, Ashesh	SMHS	Voting
Peng, Yisheng	CCAS	Voting
Rodriguez, Ken	Law Library	Nonvoting
Scalzitti, David	SMHS	Voting
Telikicherla, Puja	CPS	Voting
Temprosa, Marinella	GWSPH	Voting
Thoma, Kathleen	SMHS	Voting
Warren, John	CPS	Voting
Whitt, Karen	SON	Voting

The committee met twice during the fall semester (October 29th and December 2, 2021). In October, the committee received its charges for AY 2022-2023:

- “(1) Monitor the libraries’ online presence.
- (2) Address any deficiencies of the physical library spaces (including HVAC).
- (3) Assess staff and librarian positions and the impact of a limited budget on these, weighing this against adjustments in library collections.
- (4) Consider avenues for improving library funding.”

The chairs also worked closely with Dean Henry and Directors Scott Pagel and Laura Abate to discuss challenges and issues connected with LAI (including Gelman, Burns, Himmelfarb, Eckles and the VA campus) and with the Scholarly Communications team to address an issue about online educational materials (discussed in detail below).

After discussion and clarifying questions, the committee has prioritized its work for the spring semester in order to focus on charges 2, 3, and 4, expanding charge 4 to include improving funding for open-educational resources and open-access research.

Facilities (charge 2)

Our libraries are among the most utilized buildings on campus and the uptick in usage this semester is exciting. Facilities issues continue to be a concern. Repairs to the roof and resealing of windows have improved conditions but Gelman's HVAC system requires immediate repair. Though there have been a number of improvements, Gelman Library's HVAC system needs immediate repair. Repairs to the roof and to windows has improved issues with flooding somewhat but the HVAC system is still a top priority. Himmelfarb Library has had roof leakage and window leakage; a new roof was installed in August.

Budget (charge 3)

Hiring of librarians and staff has helped to meet the increased in-person usage of library facilities and collections. Yet there are still a significant number of backfilled positions (many from the 2016 budget crisis and the dramatic reduction of staff to mitigate financial shortfalls). LAI reports from this committee in [2018](#), [2019](#), [2020](#) and [2021](#) call attention to the systemic underfunding of the LAI system and its impact on our collections

The budget for LAI needs to be increased if GWU is to continue to pursue research excellence as one of its pillars.

Funding (charge 4)

Retention is of utmost priority. Though a number of positions are being filled, hiring takes time and there is tremendous competition from other Universities who are offering competitive salaries and flexible work. A number of our librarians have competitive offers from other universities. These conditions exacerbate longstanding, systemic issues in GWU's approach to Libraries and Academic Innovation. In 2016, the University budget prioritized collections, which resulted in a 30% reduction in librarians and staff. Most of these positions remain backfilled and have not been replaced. New hires last year have allowed the university to deliver quality online learning and to facilitate faculty research. Hiring continues this year, however staffing remains a top priority. The LAI budget cannot be reduced further without a dramatic impact on either the quality of teaching or the quality of research, both of which are pillars of our university's mission. We thus emphasize that the choice between staff or collections is a false one; we advocate strongly for hiring and retaining our excellent librarians and staff.

In addition to the issues outlined above, the committee strongly recommends an increase in resources to support open access academic publishing and open educational resources. These resources are needed in the short term to address issues, such as the Wiley/Proquest database. There is also a pressing need to address new requirements for open-access publishing of research. The current system of academic publishing is unsustainable and the time to develop new approaches to meet future requirements for open access publishing is now. **We encourage all senators to familiarize themselves with [GWU's 2015 Open Access Resolution](#).**

The [Wiley/Proquest database issue](#), in which Wiley pulled 1379 high-use titles a week before the start of the fall semester, emphasizes the connection between LAI budget and collections. For the spring semester, the committee will work with Librarians to advocate for increased funding for OER and OA resources at GWU. In 2022, the [American Association of Universities adopted the League of European Research Universities' Leiden Principles](#) (trust, diversity, openness, stewardship, and freedom). By 2026, [federally-funded research will require open-access publishing](#). If GWU is to remain competitive in securing research funding, a more robust research infrastructure (as well as faculty education on these issues) is needed.

Open Access

LAI has adopted a [theme of "Open"](#) for AY 2022-2023 and the committee has adopted a similar charge in partnership with them. The Wiley Proquest Ebooks Contract issue is a pressing one as the removal of the titles was only delayed until May 2023. At least six courses were impacted by their decision before the titles were restored to the subscription and will likely be again next fall. It is also likely that publishers will continue to adopt such practices that maximize their profit.

In the fall, chairs Rhonda Schwindt and Holly Dugan met with Irene Foster, chair of Educational Policy to discuss whether this was an issue under discussion. The committee strongly suggests that Ed Policy take notice of Wiley's decision. Holly Dugan gave a brief presentation on this topic at the October 21st meeting. The committee hopes to coordinate with other committees, including the research committee, in the spring.



Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)

January 13, 2022

Delivered by FSEC member Harald Griesshammer for Chair Tielsch

FSEC Activity

The Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) committee is considering the recommendations of the task force on Faculty Assembly membership and will bring a resolution on this matter forward to the Senate in due course. In the meantime, PEAF expects to forward a resolution on other amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan (FOP).

Upcoming Senate Reports

In the next few months, FSEC expects to place the following reports on Senate meeting agendas:

- Annual report on research;
- Annual report on fiscal planning & budgeting;
- Salary equity review report; and
- Annual Core Indicators of Academic Excellence report

Personnel Actions

There are no active grievances at the university.

Calendar

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is January 27, 2023. Draft resolutions and any other possible Senate agenda items should be forwarded to Liz Carlson in the Senate office as soon as possible to assist with the timely compilation of the FSEC meeting agenda, ideally by January 20, 2023. The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting is February 3, 2023; this meeting is being held earlier in the month due to the Board of Trustees meetings the following week.



**Faculty Senate
Provost Bracey Remarks
January 13, 2023**

Start of semester

The spring semester has already started for some programs but will begin for most students on Tuesday. Settling into a new semester and learning the rhythms of a new class schedule always requires some adjustment for our students – and for our faculty as well. As always, I encourage all of our faculty and staff to be supportive and helpful for our students and to let them know of the many resources available to them as they buckle down on their studies.

Gina Lohr

Since October 2021, Gina Lohr, our senior associate vice provost for research, has served an additional role as Provost’s Office liaison to the Virginia Science and Technology Campus (VSTC). She has filled a very important function as the key central administrative presence at VSTC, managing communications, operations, and research.

I am pleased to announce that Gina’s additional role has been formalized with the title Administrative Dean, VSTC, and she will continue to do this work in addition to her role as senior associate vice provost for research. With the administrative dean title, Gina has joined the Council of Deans and University Leadership Council as well.

I appreciate everything Gina has done to more closely align VSTC with the operations of the rest of the university, and I look forward to our continued work together.

Diversity Summit

Finally, as a reminder, we invite all students, faculty, and staff to submit session proposals for the Diversity Summit, which will be held March 1-3. Proposals are due by 11:59 p.m. on Friday, January 20, so if you know of anyone in our community who may be interested in submitting a proposal, please encourage them to do so. Information about this year’s theme and the proposal submission form are on the [Diversity Summit website](#).

We also aim to open registration for the Diversity Summit next week, so please keep an eye out for that notification.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not mention my enthusiastic support for GW’s next president, Dr. Ellen Granberg. Ellen and I met earlier this fall at a conference in New York City, where we struck up an easy rapport and enjoyed a meal together. At that time, I did not know that she was interested in joining the GW community, but I am thrilled to be reunited with her official in July and look forward to generating even more momentum for our program of study as we work together to advance the university into its third century.