GW | Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, April 14, 2023, at 2:00pm
in hybrid format (State Room/1957 E Street NW & via WebEx).

AGENDA

1. Call to order

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on March 10, 2023

3. Acknowledgment of Senate members completing terms

4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Mark Wrighton, President)

5. Brief Statements and Questions/President's Report

6. RESOLUTION 23/8: On Defining Representation of the College of Professional Studies in the Faculty Senate (Guillermo Orti, Co-Chair, Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee)

7. REPORT: Salary Equity Review (Emily Hammond, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs)

8. UPDATE: FY23 Budget and FY24 Budget Planning (Joe Cordes & Susan Kulp, Co-Chairs, Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee)

9. INTRODUCTION OF NEW RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

10. GENERAL BUSINESS
    a) Election of the 2023-2024 Faculty Senate Executive Committee
    b) Appointment of Dispute Resolution Committee Chair/Professor Joan Schaffner
    c) Senate standing committee reports
       - Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies Memo on Course Recordings
       - Educational Policy & Technology Annual Report
    d) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Jim Tielsch, Chair
    e) Provost's Remarks

11. Brief Statements and Questions/General Business

12. Adjournment

Katie Cloud
Secretary

GW | Faculty Senate

Departing Senators
April 2023

CCAS
Eric Grynaviski
Alice Alexa Joubin
Anthony Yezer

ESIA
Nicholas Vonortas

GWSB
Patrick McHugh

GSEHD
Sylvia Marotta-Walters

SEAS
Kim Roddis

SMHS
Kurt Johnson

A RESOLUTION ON DEFINING REPRESENTATION OF THE COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN THE FACULTY SENATE (23/8)

WHEREAS, the College of Professional Studies (CPS) was established in 2000 as a degree-granting academic unit of the George Washington University;

WHEREAS, over the past 23 years CPS has served non-traditional students and working professionals through both graduate and undergraduate degree programs offered both in person and online, thereby extending a George Washington University education to those who might otherwise not be able to access one;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate acknowledges the substantial contribution and commitment of the CPS faculty to the educational and scholarly betterment of the University and their exemplary service on Faculty Senate Committees in prominent roles;

WHEREAS, from its establishment the entire College of Professional Studies full-time faculty have been restricted from receiving tenure;

WHEREAS, the members of the Faculty Senate are required by the *Faculty Organization Plan* (Article III. Section 2(a)(3)) to have tenure, thereby preventing the faculty of CPS from serving in the Faculty Senate with the consequence that they are substantially excluded from participating in the shared governance of the university;

WHEREAS, the *Faculty Organization Plan* does make an exception to the tenure requirement for faculty of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (Article III. Section 2(a)(3)), stipulating that "Regular Faculty with non-tenure track appointments shall be eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, provided that such Regular Faculty shall have completed at least three years of full-time service to the University and shall have attained the rank of Associate Professor or higher…";

WHEREAS, the full-time faculty of CPS are regular full-time faculty, non-tenure track, as defined in Section I.B of the *Faculty Code*, and are eligible to hold the rank of Associate Professor or higher;

WHEREAS, without tenure, CPS faculty may not be protected from undue pressure or influence to vote in a particular way on matters before the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate considers the representation of CPS faculty in the Faculty Senate as important, without voting rights but otherwise with all rights, privileges and responsibilities of Regular Faculty members of the Faculty Senate;

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

(1)   That the *Faculty Organization Plan* be amended as set forth on Exhibit A attached to this Resolution, conditional upon the adoption of such amendments by the Faculty Assembly;

(2)   That the President, as Chair of the Faculty Assembly, is petitioned to place on the agenda for the next meeting of the Faculty Assembly a resolution to adopt the amendments to the *Faculty Organization Plan* set forth on Exhibit A attached to this Resolution;

(3)   That, upon adoption by the Faculty Assembly, the President is requested to forward those amendments to the *Faculty Organization Plan* for final approval by the Board of Trustees, making any technical corrections necessary to make them consistent with the recommendations of Senate Resolution 23/6, if adopted at the same Faculty Assembly; and

(4)   That the Faculty Senate respectfully urges the Board of Trustees not to approve any changes to the *Faculty Organization Plan* that are different from the amendments adopted by the Faculty Assembly without further consultation with the Faculty Senate and concurrence by the Faculty Assembly in keeping with the University's unbroken tradition of collaborative shared governance.

Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee
February 21, 2023

Exhibit A

THE GEORGE WASINGTON UNIVERSITY
FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN

Art. III The Faculty Senate

SECTION 2. ORGANIZATION

(a) Membership

…

(3) The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: The Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, 11 seats; the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, 3 seats; the School of Engineering and Applied Science, 4 seats; The School of Business, 5 seats; the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, 5 seats; the Law School, 4 seats; the Elliott School of International Affairs, 3 seats; the School of Public Health and Health Services, 3 seats; and the School of Nursing, 2 seats. The faculty members shall be professors, associate professors, or assistant professors in full-time service who have tenure as of the academic year succeeding the date of election. Vice presidents, assistant vice presidents, deans, associate deans, assistant deans, and other faculty members whose duties are primarily administrative in nature shall be ineligible for election as faculty members of the Senate.[2]

Exemptions to the foregoing rule regarding eligibility for service as a faculty member of the Senate are provided for the School of Medicine and Health Sciences and the School of Nursing, to the extent that, from those two schools only, Regular Faculty with non-tenure-track appointments shall be eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, provided that such Regular Faculty shall have completed at least three years of full-time service to the University and shall have attained the rank of Associate Professor or higher, and provided further, that at least half of the faculty members of the Senate from each of these two school shall be tenured faculty members. The foregoing exemption for the School of Nursing shall expire three years after the approval of that exemption by the Faculty Assembly and the University's Board of Trustees.[3]

(4) In addition, the College of Professional Studies shall elect two of its faculty members as Delegates. These Delegates shall not have the right to vote in meetings of the Faculty Senate but shall otherwise enjoy all responsibilities, rights, and privileges of regular Faculty Senate members. From this School, any regular faculty with non-tenure-track appointment shall be eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, provided that such Regular Faculty shall have completed at least three years of full-time service to the University and shall have attained the rank of Associate Professor or higher. Their terms of office shall be the same as that of regular members of the Senate, as described in (c). Their election shall follow the same rules as that of regular faculty members of the Senate, as described in Section 3.

(4)(5) The administrative members of the Senate shall consist of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Registrar, and a number of officers of administration equal to the number of degree-granting colleges, schools, and divisions. Administrative members shall have the right to debate but not to make motions or vote. They shall be appointed by the President and shall serve until their successors shall be appointed, but not less than one semester unless their service is terminated by separation from the University.

…

---

[2] Amendment by action of the University's Board of Trustees, October 19, 2012, pursuant to Faculty Assembly Resolution FA 12/1

[3] Amendment by action of the University's Board of Trustees, October 2016, pursuant to Faculty Assembly Resolution FA 17/3

SECTION 5. COMMITTEES
…

(b) The Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall consist of nine faculty members of the Senate, one CPS delegate of the Senate, and the President ex officio. The following ~~nine~~ ten schools shall have one representative each: the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, the Elliott School of International Affairs, the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, the Law School, the School of Business, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the School of Nursing, the College of Professional Studies, and the School of Public Health Services.[4] Any faculty member of the Senate and one of the two delegates from CPS shall be eligible to be elected to the Executive Committee. The Chairman shall first be elected by the Senate; the Senate shall also elect the other ~~eight~~ nine elective members of the Executive Committee, subject to the restriction that no two members of the Executive Committee shall have been elected to the Senate by the same school or faculty group. If at any time the Chair of the Executive Committee or any other voting member of the Executive Committee is unable to serve temporarily or indefinitely, the Executive Committee shall elect a replacement or replacements to serve until the next regular meeting of the Senate, at which time the Senate shall elect a replacement or replacements to serve for the remainder of the term of the Executive Committee or pro tempore for the period of absence involved. The Committee shall:
…

APPENDIX II

Bylaws of the Faculty Senate

…

SECTION 6. VOTING

(a) Elected members of the Senate shall be the voting members, except as provided below to break a tie vote. Delegates of the College of Professional Studies do not have voting rights in regular and special meetings of the Faculty Senate and are not counted towards a quorum. Delegates of the College of Professional Studies shall have voting rights in the Faculty Senate committees on which they serve, including the Executive Committee. The lack of voting rights in regular and special meetings of the Faculty Senate shall be reviewed within three years after seating the first CPS Delegates.

---

[4] Amendment by action of the Board of Trustees, October 2011, pursuant to Faculty Assembly Resolution FA 11/1

April 14, 2023

Nominees for Approval by the Faculty Senate

2023-2024 Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)
CCAS: Harald Griesshammer
ESIA: Ilana Feldman, Chair
GSEHD: Jonathan Eakle
GWSB: Arthur Wilson
GWSPH: Amita Vyas
LAW: Scott Kieff
SEAS: Tarek El-Ghazawi
SMHS: Robert Zeman
SON: Linda Briggs

2023-2024 Dispute Resolution Committee Chair
Joan Schaffner, Law School

Committee on Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits)

Memorandum to Faculty Senate on Course Recordings
April 3, 2023

Summary

On 15th September, 2022, the FSEC gave our committee (ASPP) the following charge:
> In coordination with the Provost's office, develop a clear policy addressing if and under which circumstances and to which extent classroom recordings can be consulted in promotion, tenure, and disciplinary cases as well as in other cases of concern to the committee.

ASPP had multiple conversations on the course recordings and collaborated with the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF), and Educational Policy and Technology (EPT) committees to reach a common understanding on these issues. The EPT committee last semester conducted a survey of faculty on these issues and we discussed the Joint subcommittee report from the 3 committees- Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF), Educational Policy and Technology (EPT) and ASPP on course recordings. We also had conversations with Vice-Provost for Faculty Affairs, Emily Hammond, who consulted with the Office of General Counsel.

- **Significant positives** noted in the faculty survey included access for students with long-term or temporary disabilities. Many students with disabilities have accommodations that include access to course recordings.
- **Significant concerns** noted in the faculty survey included the potential for unauthorized circulation or editing of recordings, reduced class attendance because of the availability of recordings and unauthorized use of recording for promotion and tenure or disciplinary decisions.

Additional issues discussed by the committee were:

- While the administration **owns** the physical course recordings and has access to them, how this access is used is important. Specifically, the course recordings should never be used for purposes of promotion and tenure decisions without the express permission of the faculty member involved.
- GW's location and work in politics and policy put both students and faculty at some risk of expressing opinions that might later be a source of personal or professional difficulty.
- Intellectual property rights are covered by GW's copyright policy, available at the [GW Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Risk.](#)
- Policy regarding administration access to recordings by **part-time faculty** is governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) which states that faculty must be notified if the administration reviews course recordings for evaluation purposes. We believe that a similar policy ought to apply to **full time faculty**.

Murli M. Gupta and Susan LeLacheur, Co-Chairs
Faculty Senate Appointments, Salaries, & Promotion Policies Committee (ASPP)
March 31, 2023
Revised April 3, 2023

Annual Report (AY 2022-2023)
GW Faculty Senate Committee on Educational Policy & Technology

The Committee on Educational Policy and Technology ("EPT") convened for a total of 9 meetings beginning in May 2022. Our final meeting for AY 2022-2023 will be held on April 21, 2023, and the AY 2023-2024 Committee will convene with a meeting in May 2023.

I. OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR
Faculty Senate Executive Committee's (FSEC) charge to EPT: On 15 September 2022, FSEC charged the committee with the following:

1. Advise and work with Dean Henry on the reorganization of AT & IT services at GW.
2. Consider the issue of whether GW can mandate the recording of classroom interactions (and post them online).
3. Investigate how GW is working to collaborate with Amazon HQ2 and to navigate competition from other local universities.
4. Through the relevant subcommittee, continue to monitor issues around academic and information technology, including classroom technology, technology support, and faculty workstations.

As noted in the 1 December 2022 interim report, the committee sought to address these four areas (#1 and #4 through the Technology Subcommittee, and #3 through the Classroom Recording Subcommittee)[1], while also pursuing other pressing issues related to the educational side of the committee's mandate, including enrollment planning, student housing and dining facilities, time of release of the syllabus template and the religious holidays calendar by the Provost's office, the MFA's financial situation and its impact on support for the academic mission of the university, proposed changes to the academic calendar, student success and retention, the code of academic integrity, review of Title IX training, and artificial intelligence and its impact on the academic endeavor. We hope this final report, including the Committee's continuing business noted at the conclusion, will be a useful resource for the FSEC in determining the Committee's AY 2023-2024 charge.

---

[1] EPT receives updates on a monthly basis from four of the six subcommittees that were either established this year or are continuing work from the previous year. A summary for each is provided in Section II.

Fall 2022 Meetings

Details of the Fall 2022 meetings may be found in EPT's interim report for AY 2022-2023. Key highlights are provided below:

Future enrollment planning:
- Very large, diverse and academically talented incoming Fall 2022 class. We are on target.
- Registrar, deans, housing and dining offices all working together to ensure a smooth transition for students.
- Lack of TAs to manage discussion sections.
- DSS, CAPS, Advising etc. not fully staffed.
- The Supreme Court (SCOTUS) decision on affirmative action will have to be taken into account next year.

Faculty Request to Provost's office:
- Release of syllabus template and the religious holidays calendar by the end of July.
- Questions about which religious holidays are shown on the religious holidays calendar. Faculty request that it be vetted by EPT before it is released.

Remote Accommodations/Class Recording/Medical Documentation Policies:
- Remote accommodation requests will come from Deans, not DSS.
- Faculty can choose to record or not, but policy should be stated clearly in the syllabus.
- Faculty may not require medical documentation for absences.

Medical Faculty Associates:
- Discussion of the MFA's large budget deficit in light of the budget issues that each of the schools is facing (see interim report with its attached October 7, 2022 memorandum).
- Faculty concerned about how this will impact the university's educational mission.

Resolution 23/3:
- EPT-Physical Facilities Joint Resolution for a new residence hall.
- Unanimous vote for the resolution (see below).

Alumni Auditing Program:
- Program has not restarted after COVID.
- Provost's office is working out the details and hopes to restart the program soon.

Banner:
- Geneva Henry (Vice Provost for Libraries and Information Technology) suggested that it may be better to improve current systems rather than switch to new ones.
- Work is underway to optimize and coordinate current systems. It may take 2-3 years to implement.

Classroom Recording Survey:
- The Classroom Recording subcommittee developed and distributed a Qualtrics survey to all faculty to understand who does or does not record, what types of classes they teach and why they made that choice.
- 500 faculty responded to the survey.
- Recording seems to be an all or nothing proposition for faculty (they either recorded or didn't). Those that did found it easy to set up without major problems.
  - Positives - recording was a good idea for accessibility - for those needing accommodations or with short-term disabilities.
  - Concerns – unauthorized use of recordings by posting online or sharing (this is particularly a concern among engineering faculty); intellectual property; reduced attendance; use by administration for promotion or discipline without authorization by faculty member.
- Committee recommends a formal policy on recordings. Issues to consider are ownership of recordings, parameters for administrative use, what permissions are needed to record or use recordings, and safeguards/training for authorized use. Is a resolution needed?

Proposed Changes to the Academic Calendar:
- Beginning in 2023, no Monday classes (for in-person classes) in the First Summer Session due to the new Juneteenth holiday. Classes will be on Fridays instead.
- Beginning AY 2023-2024, the first day of classes will be the 2nd to the last Thursday of August rather than the last Monday (two days earlier) to allow for a 2-day Fall Break and a full week for Thanksgiving. (Announced by Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs, Terry Murphy at the December meeting.)
- Exam period will be reduced from 8 days to 6 days. Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs, Terry Murphy sought EPT input in the December meeting, and announced the decision in the January meeting; faculty will now opt in for exam rooms.

Artificial Intelligence/Chat GPT:
- Brought up as new business in December. Committee determined it would address the issue in its January meeting.

Student Performance in Fall 2022:
- How to address gaps arising in math, writing, and study skills?
- For students who are leaving, the #1 reason is not finding community/low engagement. How to engage?
- The Office of Student Success was tasked with analyzing data to present to EPT at the February meeting.
- Perhaps set up a subcommittee at that time to study this issue.

In late December, co-chairs Irene Foster and Sarah Wagner created a google survey to gather input on student success and retention, ChatGPT/AI (see below), Spring schedule and volunteers for the Title IX training review (which FSEC tasked EPT to conduct following the Faculty Senate's deliberation of Resolution 23/4 in the December 9 meeting). Fifteen members responded.

Spring 2023 Meetings

At the January 20th meeting, as part of EPT's ongoing discussion about its role in **shared governance**, Shaista Khilji (EPT member and member of the Shared Governance Task Force) presented an overview of the task force's work and the report she gave to the Faculty Senate in its January 13th meeting. In her presentation to EPT, she outlined several recommendations regarding modes of communication between FSEC and the Board of Trustees (BoT); transparency (e.g., surrounding MFA finances), input, and feedback; the importance of BoT spending time on campus and getting to know a diverse set of faculty; the need for greater faculty participation in governance. She pushed for now getting the processes in place by which this would happen. She also advocated for the creation of a committee on strategic planning as the new president begins her term.

Also at the January meeting, the committee resumed its December discussion of the **potential impact of AI tools on higher education** (e.g., ChatGPT). Katrin Schulteiss and Guy Lotrecchiano presented on the subject, noting that the ChatGPT informational session held on January 18th had 260 very interested attendees who were looking forward to more information, discussion and guidance. Following up on resources and guidance he provided in the January 20 meeting, Gaetano Lotrecchiano (Libraries and Academic Innovation) provided members with the AI resource site at the February 17 meeting, He also recommended that EPT consider the need for an all-encompassing discussion about AI on multiple levels before making concrete

recommendations regarding its use, pros/cons, etc. He noted the Instructional Core as well as instructional staff university wide need further direction as to how the university is responding to AI in teaching and learning.

At the February 17 meeting, Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs Terry Murphy announced that the Provost had created **two new administrative committees**: the Data Privacy Consultative Committee and the Student Retention and Academic Performance Committee. EPT members expressed concern about the *process by which these committees were formed*, noting that the faculty should have input, if not responsibility, for nominating faculty members to serve on such committees, rather than simply reviewing and approving a provided membership list.

The February meeting also focused on **student success, retention, and enrollment** The Office of Student Success presented some preliminary data on a list of courses where students struggled the most. The Provost's Student Retention and Academic Performance Taskforce will approach this issue from four angles: data analysis, adequacy of placement mechanisms, student surveys and faculty surveys. The taskforce has already begun its work and hopes to be done with its report by the end of May. As part of this larger discussion and in response to our December survey, Jessica Parillo, Director of the **Counseling and Psychological Services** presented to the committee on general trends in higher education (e.g., marked increase in social anxiety [greatest seen in 12 years]; and GW-specific concerns, including increases in DSS requests, emotional support animals, single dorm rooms requests; limited services available outside of GWU; and continued constraints on her office because they are not at full staffing capacity (CAPS currently has 10 clinicians providing services but preferred staffing would be 18 clinicians).

At the March 24 meeting, the committee reviewed and discussed the **EPT Shared Governance Roadmap** (see Appendix A); the **Classroom Recordings Report** (see Appendix B); changes to the **Incomplete grade submission** process; and the proposed **changes to the Code of Academic Integrity** (see Section II below). Changes included clearer language regarding reporting procedures and rewording of cheating and plagiarism definitions to address the use of AI tools. Faculty provided feedback on the proposed warning procedure, as well as the lack of graduate student-specific language pertaining to infractions and sanctions. With that feedback and additional input from other stakeholders, EPT will review the finalized proposed revisions (put forth as a resolution to send to the Faculty Senate) in its April 21 meeting.

The April 21 meeting will also address: the Title IX training review subcommittee findings; further discussion of the shared governance roadmap; and the joint EPT/ASPP/PEAF committee recommendations on classroom recording policy and their implications. Finally, the committee

will consider whether to extend AY 2022-2023 subcommittees and the need for an AI-focused subcommittee.

II. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Technology (AT/IT): [chaired by Eric Grynaviski] The Technology Subcommittee met regularly in the fall and spring. In the fall, significant attention was paid to changes in the organization and staffing of GWIT. GWIT this year experienced significant improvements in customer service, showing sharp signs of growth in the capacity of Academic Technology and their service and support pods. In addition, delays in the delivery of faculty computers, as part of the Faculty Workstation Initiative, were largely resolved. In the spring, the committee met in January only due to scheduling conflicts and explored issues with educational data. The committee will meet one more time this spring. Our mandate was to develop a data-driven approach to understanding the responsiveness of GWIT to faculty needs, and the regular reporting of data is now a standard practice, satisfying the mandate. This final meeting will explore next steps in the partnership between the faculty and GWIT and whether a single subcommittee is the appropriate venue.

Future Enrollment Planning: [chaired by Phil Wirtz] The Future Enrollment Subcommittee met with Jay Goff and his team several times across this past year to discuss student profiles and headcount targets. The new student profile and headcount targets continue to follow the matrix that was approved by the Future Enrollment Planning Task Force in January 2021. One area of particular concern that emerged from these meetings was the possibility of an elevated D/F/W rate this year. This led to the creation of a University ad-hoc committee looking into the issue in more depth.

Shared Governance [chaired by Mountasser Kadrie] The EPT Shared Governance Subcommittee (EPT-SGS) has five members: Eyal Aviv, Sulochani Bhati, Mountasser Kadrie (Chair), Marie Price, and Laurie Posey. The EPT Committee has tasked the EPT-SGS in the academic year 2022-2023 to review and assess the current shared governance environment at GW and develop a shared governance roadmap to be presented and adopted by the EPT Committee. Since October 2022, the EPT-SGS has had monthly meetings to brainstorm and prepare the road map. Also, the EPT Shared Governance Subcommittee sought additional and valuable feedback from other faculty members on the EPT Committee and those serving as Faculty Senate. By March 2023, a road map was written up after an exhaustive process to ensure various stakeholders' input had been incorporated, and came up with a consensus draft was to be presented to the EPT committee meeting on March 24, 2023. See Appendix A ("EPT Shared Governance Roadmap").

Subcommittee on Class Recordings: [chaired by Katrin Schulteiss] In November 2022, the Subcommittee on Classroom Recordings conducted a campus-wide survey to assess faculty experience of and opinions on recording their classes. In January 2023, the subcommittee chair, together with the chairs of PEAF and ASPP, met with Vice Provost Emily Hammond to clarify issues surrounding ownership of recordings and administrative access. The results of the survey and a summary of the meeting with VP Hammond, along with information from Yordanos Baharu about faculty ability to edit and erase recordings, were compiled in a report which was circulated to the EPT, ASPP, and PEAF committees as the basis for policy recommendations. See Appendix B ("EPT Shared Governance Roadmap").

Subcommittee on Title IX Training Review: [chaired by Rohini Ganjoo] On March 23, 2023, the Title IX review committee met with Caroline Laguerre-Brown and Asha Reynolds from the Title IX Office. In addition to discussing faculty as designated reporters of Title IX complaints, there were several key takeaways:
(1) Based on Faculty Senate feedback (December meeting) customization is in progress with an enhanced online option on Vector Solutions platform (used by 2200 schools).
(2) Feedback received from Senate: Training was more corporate oriented, a lack of in-depth discussion option, lacking training how faculty should respond to Title IX complaint.
(3) Currently, there are 3 options for faculty or staff to take the training:
- On demand Live training on Zoom: Faculty from CCAS have reviewed this pilot training and have positive feedback.
- In person sessions are available- utilized by 3 schools.
- Online enhanced Vector Solutions training: contract ends in 2024

(4) Department of Education updated policy and language in May. Title IX Regulations Task Force | Title IX Office | The George Washington University (gwu.edu). Thus, the suggestion is that the Title IX review be conducted after updates are made to the training. Link to the annual report from the Title IX office: Title IX Office Annual Reports | Title IX Office | The George Washington University (gwu.edu).

Academic Integrity Code Review: This subcommittee was reconvened in AY2022-2023 to consider questions that have arisen since the adoption of the revised code. They met regularly during the Fall 2021 semester and early Spring 2022. In the March 24 meeting, Aaron Howell, Assistant Director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities, presented the proposed changes to the Academic Code of Conduct after extensive work by the subcommittee and other SSR staff. These revisions will subsequently be presented and discussed by several other entities (the Student Association, the Deans Council, etc.). EPT will review the finalized proposed changes in its April 21 meeting in the form of a resolution, which if approved, would be sent to the full Senate for deliberation in its May 2022 meeting.

Resolutions presented to the Faculty Senate

The committee reviewed and deliberated the [Resolution 23/3](#): "In Support of a New Residence Hall/Jointly Submitted by the Committees on Physical Facilities and Educational Policy & Technology." The resolution was presented to the Faculty Senate by Eric Grynaviski, Educational Policy & Technology Committee and Co-Chair, Physical Facilities Committee, and passed (22 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention).

Continuing Business for the Committee

(1) Faculty request to Provost's office regarding timely release of Fall 2023 syllabus template (mid-late July), and provision of language regarding use of AI tools

(2) Provost's Office policies on Remote Accommodations/Class Recording/Medical Documentation for Fall 2023

(3) Classroom Recording policy (follow up on the Joint EPT/ASPP/PEAF report)

(4) Student Success and Academic Performance

(5) Future enrollment planning, including the impact of SCOTUS decision on affirmative action on enrollment planning

(6) Shared governance (follow up on the proposed road map and its recommendations for enhanced faculty input and communication with institutional stakeholders)

(7) Artificial intelligence and its impact on teaching and learning

(8) Review and input on the religious holidays calendar, with timely release to faculty (mid-late July)

(9) Alumni Audit program

(10) Banner improvements

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah Wagner and Irene Foster
Co-Chairs, EPT Committee
April 6, 2023

Roster of EPT Members (2022-2023)

Wagner, Sarah*, Chair
Foster, Irene, Co-Chair
Tielsch, Jim*, FSEC Liaison
Aviv, Eyal
Badie, Sameh
Baharu, Yordanos
Beil, Cheryl
Beveridge, Scott
Bhati, Sue
Brand, Jeff
Choate, Thomas
Clarkson, Chante
Cloud, Katie
Cohen-Cole, Jamie
de la Feunte, Maria
Dimri, Manjari
Ensor, Brian
Feuer, Michael
Frierson, Tobe
Ganjoo, Rohini
Goff, Jay

Greiff, Tobias
Griesshammer, Harald*
Grynaviski, Eric*
Henry, Geneva
Johnson, Candice
Johnson, Jared
Kadrie, Mountasser
Kern, Michael
Khilji, Shaista
Kim, Mikyong
Knestrick, Joyce
Knudsen, Kevin
Lipinski, Lisa
Lotrecchiano, Guy
Murphy, Terry
Phillips, Robert
Pintz, Christine
Posey, Laurie
Price, Marie
Quinlan, Scott
Rastgoo, Edward

Robinson, Lilien
Schultheiss, Katrin*
Schumann, Mary Jean
Schwartz, Lisa
Seavey, Ormond
Siczek, Megan
Smith, Andrew
Stoddard, Morgan
Subramaniam, Suresh
Thorpe, Jane Hyatt
Toll, Ben
Torres, Jason
Trammel, Shauntae
von Barghahn, Barbara*
Vyas, Amita*
Wilson, Arthur*
Wirtz, Phil*
Wolfe, Zachary
Zara, Jason

EPT Shared Governance Road Map

- Establish an ongoing faculty engagement effort to promote transparency in discussing critical academic issues. It was suggested to consider some strategies such as:

  - posting the EPT committee agenda and minutes summary available through a webpage
  - having the possibility regularly to attend the EPT from various GW stakeholders to engage with the EPT meetings
  - elicit faculty input by including instructions on the minutes (or other means?) to provide and submit feedback and suggestions to the School's representative
  - produce and post the interim and final reports about subcommittee-shared governance to highlight faculty governance activities

- Establish a shared governance plan and structure process that govern the engagement between EPT and GW stakeholders (Provost, Dean's Council, Department Chairs, and possibly others who are relevant).

  - collaborate with the Provost Office at the beginning and end of the semester on critical academic issues
  - work with members of the EPT to define the top five areas where the EPT role is essential to promote a deliberate process
  - create a detailed plan to determine the time frame and course of action related to each of the top five areas

- Establish a policy that seeks faculty input on who serves on University level tasks force and committees before they are named. Also, the university administration needs to reach out to the Faculty Senate if faculty are needed for committees. The Faculty Senate should work with the administration in determining who those faculty should be.
- Requesting some Board of Trustees members to engage/attend the EPT committee.
- Clarify the role and scope of the Liaison of the EPT committee with the Faculty Senate and support frequent engagement through the Liaison. This engagement would give the Liaison needed insight and talking points about shared governance to share with the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustee academic affairs and seek feedback about suggestions that the EPT shared governance should consider.

Classroom Recordings Report
Issued to EPT, PEAF, ASPP Committees

Feb. 9, 2023

Contents:

p. 1. Narrative summary of faculty survey. Survey administered Nov. 2022

p. 4. Legal Issues: Summary of Jan. 18, 2023 meeting with Vice Provost Emily Hammond on legal ownership of classroom recordings.

p. 6. Information on faculty recording deletion capability and university retention of recordings from Yordanos Baharu, Exec. Dir. of Academic Enterprise Applications.

1. Summary of Survey

A total of 559 faculty of all ranks filled out all or part of the survey. Nearly 43% came from CCAS and nearly 16% from SPH. The other schools each provided less than 10% of the total responses. (The survey was not circulated in the Law School because that school has a longstanding (pre-dating COVID) policy of mandatory recording and centrally controlled selective release.)

Over half the respondents (53%) were tenured or tenure-track and 34% were full-time non-tenure track. Less than 6% of respondents were part-time and less than 6% were specialized faculty.

The vast majority of respondents (74%) taught in-person classes, though 19% taught some combination of in-person and online classes.

Faculty Recording Policies

Among those who taught **undergraduate lecture classes**, over 70% engaged in some form of classroom recording. The largest group (46%) recorded all their classes and made those

recordings available to all students in the class. About 10% recorded all classes but only released selectively while another 10% recorded some of their classes and a few recorded portions of classes. 28% did not record at all.

Those who taught **undergraduate seminars** were the least likely to record in any form. (58% did not record any classes). About a quarter (24%) recorded all classes and made those recordings available to all students in the class. Less than 8% selectively released recordings and less than 7% recorded only some classes.

Among those who taught **graduate lecture classes**, responses were similar to those for undergraduate lectures. A plurality (45%) recorded all classes and released them to all students and about 70% recorded in some form. (30% did not record at all.)

Among those teaching **graduate seminars**, a plurality of (48%) did not record at all while 25% recorded all classes and released those recordings to all students in the class about 15% in this category recorded some classes.

The vast majority of faculty teaching **lab classes** (71%) did not record classes at all.

For **on-line courses**, almost two-thirds (64%) recorded all classes and made recordings available to all students, while only 11% did not record at all.

(One should bear in mind that faculty who chose to respond to the survey are probably more likely to have at least attempted to record, so these percentages may not accurately reflect overall faculty practices.)

Faculty Experiences with Recording:

A full 75% of respondents reported having few problems, manageable problems, or no problems setting up recording for their classes, while only 13% reported major problems and 12% did not attempt to set up recording. (Again, one should note that faculty who did not attempt to set up recording are probably less likely to have responded to the survey.)

About two-thirds of respondents did not attempt either adaptive release (68%) or recording portions of classes (67%). About a quarter experienced few, manageable, or no problems, while very few people reported major problems, suggesting that those who attempted these processes were probably comfortable or familiar with technology to begin with.

Well over half (61%) did not attempt to delete recordings, but 36% reported few, manageable, or no problems. As with adaptive release, very few reported major problems suggesting again that only those already familiar with or comfortable with the technology attempted to delete their recordings.

Reasons for Recording:

The survey listed five reasons for recording classes and asked faculty to report whether they regarded those factors as "Very Important," "Moderately Important," "Somewhat Important," "Minimally Important", or "Not Important." The five factors were "Accessibility for Students with Disabilities," "Accessibility for English Language Learners," Accessibility for Students with Short-term Illnesses," Accessibility for Students with Short-term Conflicts," and "Enhanced Learning for all Students."

Two reasons were labelled "very important" by a majority of respondents. These were "Accessibility for Students with Disabilities" (56%) and "Accessibility for Students with Short-term Illnesses" (56%). A majority of faculty rated all five factors as either "Very Important" or "Moderately Important."

Reasons for Not Recording Classes:

The survey listed six reasons for not recording classes and asked faculty to report whether they regarded those factors as "Extremely Important," "Very Important," "Moderately Important," "Somewhat Important," "Minimally Important", or "Not Important." The six reasons were "Student Privacy," "Instructor Privacy," "Unauthorized Use for P&T or Disciplinary Action," "Unauthorized Circulation or Editing," "Loss of Intellectual Property Rights," "Class Attendance Concerns."

Two reasons were rated as "Extremely Important" or "Very Important" by at least half of faculty: "Unauthorized Circulation or Editing of Recordings" (54%) and "Class Attendance Concerns" (50%). Two other reasons fell just short of the 50% mark: "Intellectual Property Rights" (46%) and "Unauthorized Use for P&T or Disciplinary Action (44%).

CONCLUSIONS FROM SURVEY DATA:

The relatively high response rate to the survey suggests that many faculty care about the issue of classroom recordings. It is not surprising that faculty were far more likely to record lecture

classes than seminar or lab classes and that, of those who recorded, most recorded all classes and released them to all students in the class as that is the easiest method. Most respondents did not attempt any of the other recording options (adaptive release, selective recording, erasing) suggesting that more communication and instruction on these processes would be helpful. A majority of faculty see value in creating recordings, especially for students with disabilities or with short-term illnesses, but they remain concerned about a number of factors, especially the unauthorized circulation of recordings and the negative effect of recordings on class attendance.

2. Legal Issues: Summary of Jan. 18, 2023 meeting with Vice Provost Emily Hammond on legal ownership of classroom recordings

In attendance: Vice Provost Emily Hammond; Murli Gupta, Chair of ASPP; Guillermo Orti, Chair of PEAF; Katrin Schultheiss, Chair of Classroom Recording Subcommittee of EPT

The following summary, originally based on notes taken by Senate members, was revised and approved by the Vice Provost.

1. Copyright of Intellectual Property

VP Hammond stated that GW has a copyright policy that covers ownership of intellectual property. According to the [GW Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Risk](): "For Faculty and Librarians, the university only claims ownership of the copyright if the work qualifies as a Work Made for Hire, or if the work's creation required Substantial Use of university resources, as defined below." (See endnote* for definition of "Substantial Use")

Bottom line: Full-time faculty retain ownership of IP of recorded lectures. Exceptions to this general rule are if the lectures are part of a "work-for-hire contract" or produced as part of a sponsored project.

2. Access to recordings

Can faculty deny administrators or others access to recordings of their classes?

There are a number of circumstances in which faculty cannot deny access to recordings. For example, access may be required to comply with disability laws or legal proceedings.

The university legally owns the **files**** that are recorded using university equipment or software. VP Hammond stated that there are sometimes valid reasons for an administrator to review a recording, for example, if there are factual issues about an event in a classroom that cannot otherwise be resolved, or if a student has filed a grievance about a matter in the classroom obligating an administrator to develop a full understanding of what happened. Administrators are expected to access recordings for valid, University-based reasons such as these. As a matter of practice, VP Hammond emphasized that administrators do not have the time to go on "fishing expeditions" to falsely impugn a colleague. Moreover, a number of the circumstances when a recording was viewed worked to clarify facts in favor of faculty.

We stressed that most faculty are not aware that their recordings can be accessed and that they should be explicitly informed of that fact. "Trust us" is not a reliable or even acceptable policy.

3. **Policy regarding access to recordings for part-time faculty** is governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement which states that faculty must be notified if the administration reviews recordings. We felt that a similar policy ought to apply to full time faculty, i.e., the faculty must be notified when the administration decides to review any recordings.

4. On the question of whether faculty can voluntarily provide recordings as a mechanism for enabling review of their teaching, VP Hammond said that they believed that in-person classes should be reviewed in person in order for the faculty member to provide the very best opportunity for a fulsome review. On-line classes could be reviewed via recordings. This appeared to be a recommendation rather than a legal stipulation.

Notes:

* "Substantial Use" of university resources is that use of university laboratory, studio, audio, audiovisual, video, television, broadcast, computer, computational or other facilities, resources and Staff or Students which:
> · Falls outside the scope of the Faculty member's or Librarian's normal job responsibilities or the Student's academic program or
> · Entails a Faculty member's or Librarian's use of such resources that are not ordinarily available to all or virtually all Faculty members with comparable status in the same school or department or to all or virtually all similarly situated Librarians.
> · The term Substantial Use does not include the use of university provided office space, local telephone, library resources and computer equipment incidental to outside activities that are

permitted under the Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Investigators.

** The University pays for and owns the equipment, software licenses, and servers. It also pays for the electricity, wifi, and other utilities that we use. The IP that is created with and housed in these technologies is specifically covered by the IP policy. The University is not making a claim to the IP, and the faculty are not donating it to the University. Murli Gupta noted that "the books, documents and other materials I have in university-owned facility, viz my office, are mine and not GW's." VP Hammond agrees to this.

3. Information on faculty recording deletion capability and university retention of recordings from Yordanos Baharu, Exec. Dir. of Academic Enterprise Applications (Per e-mail from Yordanos, Feb. 7, 2023.)

Question 1: Are faculty able to delete individual class recordings?

Platform	Can Faculty Delete?	Note
Blackboard Collaborate	Yes	File gets moved to the system trash folder for 30 days and gets permanently deleted ("hard delete") after the 30 days.
Zoom	Yes	File gets moved to the user's trash folder for 30 days and gets permanently deleted after the 30 days. The user has the option to immediately delete or restore a file by going to their Zoom trash folder.
Webex	Yes	File gets moved to the user's trash folder for 30 days and gets permanently deleted after the 30 days. The user has the option to immediately delete or restore a file by going to their Zoom trash folder.
ECHO360	Currently No*	This feature is not enabled for ECHO360 as all file deletions are permanent ("hard delete") with no option to restore accidentally deleted files. (ECHO has informed us that the option to move files to a user's trash folder is on their roadmap.) - Faculty can request deletion of recordings by sending an email to itl@gwu.edu - Files that have not been accessed in 24 months will be deleted from the platform

MS Teams	Yes	File gets moved to the user's One Drive recycle bin for 30 days and gets permanently deleted after the 30 days. The user has the option to immediately delete or restore a file by going to their One Drive recycle bin.

Question 2: How long does the university keep recordings?

In an email sent to all users on 12/19/22, the following retention plan was defined:
--Video recordings stored in web conferencing tools as of **January 1, 2023**, will be saved for **180 days**. After 180 days, recordings will be moved to the meeting host's "Trash" folder for an additional **30 days.** Once the 30-day Trash countdown expires, the recordings will be permanently deleted and cannot be recovered. On **June 30, 2023** all recordings that are older than 180 days will be moved to the meeting host's "Trash" folder for 30 days. Once the 30-day Trash countdown expires, the recordings will be permanently deleted and cannot be recovered.