



Faculty Senate

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SENATE MEETING
HELD ON MARCH 1, 2024
HYBRID: 1957 E STREET/STATE ROOM & WEBEX**

Present: President Granberg; Provost Bracey; Executive Committee Chair Feldman; Parliamentarian Binder; Registrar Cloud; Senate Office Staff Liz Carlson and Jenna Chaojareon; Deans Ayres, Feuer, Henry, Lach, Matthew, and Wahlbeck; Professors Anenberg, Badie, Briggs, Brinkerhoff, Callier, Eakle, El-Ghazawi, Engel, Gore, Gupta, Kargaltsev, Kay, Kieff, Kulp, Lu, Mahshie, Marvar, Mazhari, Olesen, Orti, Parsons, Rain, Sarkar, Schultheiss, Schwindt, Tschirhart, von Barghahn, Vyas, Wagner, Wilson, Wirtz, and Zeman.

Absent: Deans Bass, Goldman, Kelly-Weeder, Perry, and Riddle; Professors Bamford, Borum, Clarke, Gore, Gutman, Kramon, Pittman, and Tielsch.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:08p.m.

The President relayed a request from online attendees that speakers in the State Room identify themselves before making their comments; the camera angles in the room do not permit online attendees to see who is speaking.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The [minutes](#) of the February 9, 2024, Faculty Senate meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Ellen Granberg, President)

The President's report is [attached](#).

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Professor Wirtz relayed interest from the GW School of Business (GWSB) faculty in the wake of last month's discussion about the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA). Specifically, there was some confusion around the current role of former CFO Mark Diaz. Mr. Diaz was closely involved with the original MFA restructuring work, and Professor Wirtz asked whether Mr. Diaz currently has any affiliation with GW with regard to the MFA. He added that it has been the faculty's understanding that there is no continuing relationship there. President Granberg responded that Mr. Diaz has

historical expertise in this area and has been called upon to provide information in this regard. CFO Fernandes added that he does speak regularly with Mr. Diaz about the University Health Services agreement and that Mr. Diaz is paid as a consultant for this work. The President noted that she had not been aware of this arrangement. Professor Wirtz respectfully asked the President to consider whether the Senate has at any point been misled or given misinformation about Mr. Diaz's role and relationship with the university. President Granberg responded that she would look into this.

Professor Schultheiss asked who beyond General Counsel Barber and Dean of Students Coleman is involved with the process of reconciling university policies. Provost Bracey responded that this is a working group involving personnel related to various policy areas and that he is tangentially involved with this group; more detail can be brought back to the Senate on this.

PROVOST'S REPORT (Chris Bracey, Provost)

The Provost's report is [attached](#).

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PROVOST'S REPORT

Professor Wagner asked to what extent the future-focused/planning conversations happening in the next ten days are critical to the formation of the ultimate strategic planning process. She noted that it will be key for faculty to know if they will be missing their opportunity to participate in this process if they do not express their concerns and thoughts now. Second, she requested an update on the Diversity Program Review report and asked how the Provost sees this work being articulated in the strategic planning process.

Provost Bracey responded that the Diversity Program Review report is being finalized now and that he expects to receive it well in advance of any strategic planning finalization.

He stated that the current future-focused conversations are being done early and that a report on identified pillars will be compiled organically throughout this process. This report will also be test-driven with the faculty before it is brought to the Board. He added that he and the President are discussing holding a half-day retreat with the Senate in order to more formally engage this group in discussion and feedback on the report. That feedback will then be incorporated into the report that goes to the Board. As to the relative weight of participating now as opposed to later in the process, he expressed that both are important. The current discussions are focused on identifying thematic areas. In the fall, the work will focus on looking at those identified areas for opportunities at GW. (As an example, artificial intelligence could be a thematic area identified as warranting deeper conversation this spring; in the fall, the next steps would focus on looking for specific opportunities at GW in this area.)

Professor Wagner followed up, requesting that the asks from the Diversity Program Review report be shared with the community. The review process and its report afford an opportunity for the university to double down and expand on its commitment to this area. She hoped that this would not be left aside in a larger strategic planning process. The Provost noted that the ask for the report was for a set of measurable things that would allow the university to identify progress in certain areas; he expressed his hope that this is what will be in the final report.

Professor Sarkar noted that the Research Committee participated today in a very robust conversation around a strategic framework. He noted that the committee was asked very general questions to start the conversation, and he asked whether a set of very diverse ideas in response can in fact be distilled to a workable plan. The Provost responded in the affirmative. Professor Sarkar expressed a concern that the eventual outcome might not actually be what initial suggestions intended. The Provost reiterated that the general conversations being held now are meant to identify broad themes. Next year, the harder conversations about priorities within those areas will begin. Those conversations will narrow to see what GW can do and can financially support in these areas; it will be important to tie a strategic framework to the university's budgetary reality.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (Ilana Feldman, Chair)

The Report of the Executive Committee is [attached](#).

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

None.

[RESOLUTION 24/8: To Approve Temporary Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity](#) (Sarah Wagner, Co-Chair, Educational Policy & Technology Committee)

Professor Wagner provided some background and timeline information about the resolution. At the December 15 Educational Policy & Technology (EPT) committee meeting, Christy Anthony, the Director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (SRR), presented a report on proposed academic integrity panel mitigation strategies, given the significant increase in academic integrity violations and cheating. Over the winter break, EPT members provided feedback through a survey on proposed strategies. On January 15, Ms. Anthony returned to EPT to present a revised proposal, but, after deliberations, the committee did not approve the draft resolution, as there were still several outstanding questions. An ad hoc subcommittee was created to revise and strengthen the resolution. The subcommittee proposed a temporary solution; Professor Wagner noted that several EPT members served on this subcommittee and extended particular thanks to Eric Grynawski and Candice Johnson for their work on this.

Providing some additional context Professor Wagner noted that students, including GW's most at-risk students, can get themselves into trouble—sometimes through a single, significant error in judgment. Without a timely hearing, they can't register, graduate, or move on with their studies—they can't put it behind them. Having a timely panel is extremely important for helping students, especially those with higher levels of risk. This is especially important for populations such as first-generation students or students experiencing significant financial or emotional distress. Serving on academic integrity panels is an important way to support our students, and she appealed to faculty to consider volunteering.

Second, there is a necessary reason why this has to be a temporary solution: the intensity of the caseload combined with the limited number of panelists means this interim mitigation strategy will

likely lead to burnout. It loads up a small number of people with more work. Thus, it is not sustainable. EPT will work with SRR to assess the trends over the next several months to see if indeed we a more permanent revision to the code is warranted. However, the other approach is prevention—helping students understand academic integrity more fully and helping faculty create evaluative measures that reflect the changing conditions and tools in use, including generative artificial intelligence (AI).

Professor Wagner noted that EPT would like to thank Ms. Anthony and her team for their hard work in these challenging circumstances and for taking seriously the committee’s feedback and encouraging further productive exchanges between SRR and EPT’.

Professor Wagner recognized Ms. Anthony to comment on the resolution. Ms. Anthony reported that SRR experienced a 313% increase in reports of academic integrity violations in Fall 2023 over the average of the previous two fall semesters. This is not entirely attributable to generative AI, but this is a factor. She affirmed Professor Wagner's concerns about student academic progression and the care of the academic integrity of the institution. The change proposed in the resolution is an important step to allow SRR to resolve cases while gathering more information.

To assist with a key issue of resolving cases in a timely manner, the proposal leaves the Code unchanged except for an addendum at the end, which revises the composition of a full AI panel. Currently, two faculty and three students comprise a panel, with the third student only voting in a tie. Under the temporary revision, a full panel would be three members from the trained pool. One must be a student, and one must be a faculty member. Unchanged is that the student will serve as the presiding officer, but that student will have a vote in the process. Also unchanged is the expectation (though not a requirement) that the panel include at least one member from the school or college in which the reported violation occurred.

Professor Wagner moved consideration of the resolution; the motion was seconded.

Professor Wilson understood that getting faculty volunteers for these cases is a challenge and asked if they might be more directly asked or pressed to serve. Ms. Anthony responded that the group discussed a jury pool model; currently, faculty receive training on the Code and their obligations under it. Feedback from faculty serving in that role is that the (asynchronous) training they receive is essential; the group felt that a jury pool model would be a constraint on training.

Professor Wirtz stated that he is supporting the resolution, albeit reluctantly, raising a question about the temporary nature of the modification. He noted that the Senate is not typically in the business of acting on temporary resolutions. Recognizing that there is really no choice in this situation but to do so, he asked how this situation might be headed off in the future, particularly given that the issue of generative AI has been on the table for some time.

Ms. Anthony responded that two measures discussed were either making this change permanent or amending the Code to indicate that temporary revisions don’t require Senate approval. However, EPT did not want temporary edits without Senate passage. She noted that a temporary measure allows for assessment of how well this works; it may turn out that this model fits the community’s needs, but those data do not yet exist. A temporary measure allows for data gathering while also being responsive to the needs of the moment. She added that the Fall 2023 semester was the first

when generative AI programs were available to students at no or very low cost, which has led to this spike.

Professor Wirtz asked whether Ms. Anthony anticipated that other temporary changes might be needed and whether there might be a constraint on the types of situations under which temporary changes might be required in the future. Ms. Anthony responded that the reason for this temporary change was very much due to limited data and an acute problem where the system is not functioning as intended for the care and integrity of the university, its students, its faculty, and its registration processes. In that set of circumstances—a novel situation beyond the university’s control leading to a logjam in system—she noted that she could see temporary measures being necessary. She added that, in her 5½ years at the university, this is the first time she has considered or advocated for temporary changes to either code under her purview. This is an unusual measure that she is not inclined to pursue as a regular practice.

Professor Brinkerhoff noted her support for the resolution and commended EPT for putting GW’s students and mission first; the decision was not taken lightly. She suggested that it might make sense to task departments with ensuring that a certain percentage of their faculty have this training so they can step in in times of high need.

Professor Parsons asked about the nature of the assessment process and whether SRR will be able to determine the source of the increase in cases. Ms. Anthony responded that SRR observed a 476% increase in the cheating category, where generative AI cases would go. SRR has not done a quantitative assessment for each case and whether generative AI was involved; this is something that could be done in the longer term. She envisioned that the assessment of this temporary measure would include all the data in the proposal as well as a breakdown of the before and after for some of the data; e.g., findings of responsibility and sanctions. She added that certain academic areas of the institution are seeing this particular increase; it is not yet clear whether those areas are the vanguard of a wave that will spread more broadly or whether these issues are isolated to these areas. In the interest of safeguarding the integrity of the university, she noted that she is working on instituting conversations with those areas, which will bring more data to the process. Finally, she stated, data gathering occurs simultaneously with case resolution, and SRR has a case management system that is built with significant analytics. Part of the resolution is that SRR will submit a report on this change and its effect prior to the beginning of the spring 2025 semester.

Professor Eakle appreciated the challenges faced and stated his support for the resolution. He asked what other challenges to recruiting faculty service exist beyond the training requirement. Ms. Anthony responded that moving the training to an asynchronous format has helped. Even since this proposal came forward, she noted that she is seeing a small increase in participation. Not wishing to speak for the faculty, she suggested that part of the issue may be the requirement that panel members are full-time faculty (noting that there are complex pros and cons to allowing adjunct participation) and the extensive demands on faculty time.

Professor Eakle asked whether there are any criteria or particular expertise required to be an effective faculty panel member. Ms. Anthony responded that there are not, noting that helpful qualities include an ability to think critically, to exchange information and hear conflicting ideas, and to see collaborative resolution. She added that it is very helpful to have faculty from diverse backgrounds. Professor Eakle asked whether SRR hopes to make this change permanent. Ms. Anthony responded that this will depend on what the data show.

Professor Wagner stressed the prevention element, noting that, if cheating is up due to generative AI, faculty need to better understand the world in which students are learning and generating information and the ways faculty may need to be responsive. She recalled the Provost's statement on the use of generative AI that was shared with faculty and suggested that the administration encourage unit-based training and discussions around that statement to think about generative AI within specific units (e.g., potential misuse, its use in teaching). She also suggested that messaging about this over the summer would be helpful.

Professor Anenberg stated her support for the resolution, noting that she hears within the School of Public Health (GWSPH) that the logjam is an impediment to student progress. She asked whether this change will be enough to address the backlog of cases. Ms. Anthony responded that she believes it will be. One challenge is planning for caseload, which is not in SRR's control. This change will help, as will prioritizing cases for students needing resolution sooner rather than later in order to graduate or register.

Professor Wilson asked whether better technology for AI detection is becoming available. Ms. Anthony responded that this is something of a "space race"—AI improves as the detection improves. She shared the example of a GW faculty member who put through AI detection software an AI-generated essay as well as her own peer-reviewed and published article. The AI generated essay received a 25% chance of being AI-generated, while her own work received an 83% chance. She added that faculty are welcome to submit AI detection feedback as part of cases, but this is part of the reason that she talks a great deal about prevention and promoting academic integrity over surveillance models.

Professor El-Ghazawi agreed that detection is difficult and observed that faculty can revise the nature and content of their assignments to make it more difficult to use AI to successfully complete an assignment.

No amendments were proposed. The resolution was adopted by unanimous consent.

Professor Wirtz moved to add Resolution 24/9 (On Academic Freedom), distributed to the Senate membership yesterday, to the meeting agenda. The motion was seconded and adopted by unanimous consent.

[RESOLUTION 24/9: On Academic Freedom](#) (Katrin Schultheiss, Educational Policy & Technology Committee)

Professor Schultheiss introduced the resolution with the following remarks:

“By way of introducing this resolution on Academic Freedom, I'd like to share with you EPT's rationale for drafting it and presenting it for consideration to the Senate.

“There are several points I would like to stress in this regard. The first is that EPT Committee members feel strongly that “Freedom of expression is a critical component of the student experience and central to GW's educational mission;” It is for that reason that the EPT committee felt compelled to draft the resolution. Other Senate committees may well decide to put forward their

own resolutions on the issue, but EPT believes that freedom of expression is essential to student learning and it is with that conviction, that we put the resolution before the Senate.

“This issue is pressing because there continue to be protests and other expressions of free speech by students on campus, some of which have resulted in the university imposing disciplinary measures that have been contested and disputed. In this volatile situation, when clarity around rules and guidelines are essential, the university has been notably slow to articulate its free speech provisions despite the fact that there has been particular urgency around the issue since October 2023 and despite repeated questions on the matter from the Senate.

“This brings me to my second main point of context—again, a point that has been made on several earlier occasions on the Senate floor—that, until very recently, there has been no Senate consultation in the academic freedom and free speech clarification process even though the Senate developed Guidelines for Academic Freedom in 2017 and re-affirmed them 2018.

“A good example of this lack of consultation is that “The recently unveiled plan on “Strengthening the Community in Challenging Times” was prepared and issued without consultation with the Senate or EPT;”

“I hope that it is evident in both the “Whereas” clauses and the resolving clauses of the resolution that it is these issues of urgency and lack of consultation that the resolution is intended to address.

“One last point: This Resolution is offered in the interest of spurring meaningful conversation between faculty and administrators on the critical issue of academic freedom and freedom of expression throughout the university community. There is a lot to discuss especially in these fraught and precarious times. These issues will likely get more tense and contentious in the coming months. We hope that the administration sees the faculty as partners in our mutual efforts to protect and provide clarity around these freedoms for all members of the GW community.”

Professor Schultheiss moved consideration of Resolution 24/9; the motion was seconded.

Professor Wilson noted that FSEC raised a question about the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) committee’s view of the resolution, which clearly touches on that committee’s mission. Professor Orti responded that PEAF has not had a chance to formally weigh in on the resolution but that an informal conversation with EPT took place after the resolution came to FSEC. Professor Wagner noted that Professor Orti was invited to the EPT meeting where the resolution was discussed, but he was not able to attend. She expressed regret over the lack of a formal opportunity to engage PEAF but added that this resolution emerges from EPT because EPT faculty members have received multiple messages and requests to take up this issue, particularly around student experiences and perspectives on free speech and GW’s policies as they are being implemented. This has a direct impact on the classroom experience. Therefore, while this is a faculty issue of academic freedom, EPT would like to contribute to the discussion from a classroom experience perspective.

Professor Feldman appreciated that Professor Schultheiss’s opening comments highlighted the close linkage between the experience of faculty in exercising their academic freedom and the experience of students on campus in being able to exercise their freedom of expression. These are not simply parallels as part of a broader landscape but actually impact each other, and faculty feel the

constraints on others' expression. She asked how this linkage is articulated, observing that, in her read of the resolution, this feels a little muted. Recognizing that the discussion is not yet at the amendment stage, she wondered if there might be a way to more clearly state this link. Professor Schultheiss suggested that the best place to do so would likely be Resolving Clause (RC) 1, adding some wording to indicate the mutual dependence of academic freedom and freedom of speech for students and faculty.

Professor Wirtz observed that the Columbia University Faculty Senate passed a remarkably similar resolution in February. Requesting parliamentary guidance in advance, he noted that he would eventually recommend that the Senate change the title of the resolution. In the spirit of the present discussion, he suggested that "Reconfirming the GW Faculty Senate's Commitment to the Principles of Academic Freedom and Shared Governance" is much more indicative of the resolution's content. He noted that the importance of academic freedom and shared governance cannot be overemphasized and that the Senate needs to go on the record again that these are principles it views as absolutely fundamental to the experience of GW's students and faculty.

Professor Brinkerhoff observed that this is an interesting and important point and asked to clarify whether this captures Professor Schultheiss's introductory point around faculty representation in the discussions of university policies. Professor Schultheiss responded that RC2 does this by reaffirming that all university communications and policies about freedom of speech and academic freedom should be a product of collaborative effort, and all should explicitly reference the Guidelines on Academic Freedom.

Professor El-Ghazawi stated that, while adding shared governance to the title is meaningful, it takes away from the resolution's emphasis on academic freedom; shared governance cuts across many areas. Professor Wagner responded that she understood this point, but she underscored the necessity of shared governance in this area. Faculty have been asking to be involved in this process and are still not being included in the policy streamlining conversations. Professor El-Ghazawi agreed but suggested that a separate resolution should then come forward on shared governance. Professor Wagner responded that this resolution provides a moment to highlight this particular opportunity for it.

The Provost noted that there are no speech-related guidelines that have been changed or that are under consideration for change. The Student Rights & Responsibilities document contains robust provisions regarding the protection of student speech, and the leadership committee review is not one that is related to speech or academic freedom.

Professor Wagner responded that the resolution reflects student perspectives shared with some faculty that center on confusion about policy. This could be as simple as a student not being aware of the policy or perceiving unequal application of the policy. This is less about a problem with the policy itself than it is about how the policy is understood and implemented and what kind of discourse there is on campus between students and faculty. President Granberg noted that the conversation happening now is about what was learned last semester and the development of a document of proposed changes as a result. That document will then go into conversation with all of the governance groups, including the Senate. The current work is a scan through events with those who were most involved; the intention then is to hold conversations with faculty and students.

Professor Schultheiss noted that the point being made today is that the faculty is trying to encourage a move away from administrative groups developing a plan and then bringing it to the Senate for a vote. Faculty want to be part of the plan development itself.

Discussion of the resolution concluded, and amendments were proposed.

Professor Feldman moved to amend RC1, adding “and their mutual dependence” after “faculty.” The motion was seconded, and the amendment was adopted by unanimous consent.

Professor Orti noted that the action requested in RC3 has already happened, with the resolution likely having been drafted prior to this taking place. He moved to amend the resolution by removing RC3. The motion was seconded, and the amendment was adopted by unanimous consent.

Professor Wirtz moved to amend the resolution title to: “Reconfirming the GW Faculty Senate’s Commitment to the Principles of Academic Freedom and Shared Governance.” The motion was seconded; unanimous consent was requested but not obtained.

Professor El-Ghazawi stated that he believed academic freedom and freedom of speech deserves sole focus in the title. Professor Sarkar requested the rationale for the amendment. Professor Wirtz reiterated that shared governance is intrinsically embodied in the resolution. While the initial title is technically correct, what gives the resolution particular strength is that the Senate is going on record—as it always should—about its commitment to the principles of academic freedom and shared governance.

Professor Wilson raised the question of social media, noting that this is an increasingly important aspect of this topic. President Granberg observed that this is a very big topic and, given that questions and discussion about the resolution have concluded and amendments are now being considered, recommended bringing it to the relevant committees for consideration.

Professor Gupta noted his support for the amendment. Professor Eakle observed that shared governance is embedded in document and moved to amend Professor Wirtz’s amendment to drop “shared governance” from the revised title. A vote on Professor Eakle’s amendment failed 5-14, with two abstentions. Professor Wirtz’s amendment was then adopted by unanimous consent.

The resolution as amended was adopted by unanimous consent.

REPORT: Salary Equity Review (Rumana Riffat, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs)

Vice Provost Riffat’s [full report](#) was distributed with the agenda for this meeting. Before turning to questions, she presented an [executive summary](#) of her full report.

Professor Wirtz inquired about the basis for so few adjustments being made in the Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (CCAS) relative to the other schools. From the data presented, he observed that other schools are generally seeing adjustments at the 50% levels, but CCAS is at just 15%. Vice Provost Riffat responded that, in CCAS, the outliers included two retirements, some faculty who were classified as poor performers in the review process, and other faculty who were determined to be at appropriate salary levels based on their duties. Professor Wirtz followed up,

asking whether the review process differs for CCAS versus the other schools. The model seems to be working well for the Law School, GWSB, the Graduate School of Education & Human Development (GSEHD), and the School of Engineering & Applied Science (SEAS); he wondered if these numbers indicated that it is not working well for CCAS. Dean Wahlbeck noted that, in CCAS, he has observed dynamics year over year. One is in the departmental home: if a high salary outlier is identified in a department, many other faculty in that department are then coded as low. The next step is to look at salaries across the entirety of CCAS to make a determination about whether those disparities need to be addressed.

Professor Wirtz noted that the committee preparing this methodology raised this very issue and considered leaving outliers out to avoid this problem; he wondered if a methodological tweak might be required. He recalled that the Provost had objected to this previously, but, given that the issue persists, he asked when the review committee will reconvene to determine if the methodology is working as it should be.

The Provost responded that he had expressed support for a methodological review under the previous Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. That planning was underway, but there was then a change in the Vice Provost role. In preparing for today's meeting, he predicted that the question of reconstituting the committee would be raised and that he does think it is time to do so. His previous concern was that the timing of such a review might potentially interfere with a timely review process. At this point, however, he believed there would be enough time to convene the group and look at the methodology to see if there are other elements that might be incorporated. For example, he recalled that there have been questions about whether the methodology should be reviewed with an eye to assessing race and gender disparities. Vice Provost Riffat can take this up with a reconstituted committee. He cautioned that, as the number of variables increases, so does the complexity of the regression. This might mean that the review will take additional time to work out any kinks in the modeling; this could interfere with the elegant but quick review that has been possible over the past several years. He noted he does not want to set up a system where, by the time the regression has been developed and run, one or two merit cycles have passed, and the data is stale.

Professor El-Ghazawi observed that the size of the annual merit pool for faculty contributes to the issue as the pool isn't large enough to correct many of these issues. The result is often that senior or older faculty frequently receive below-average increases as a result of pressure on the merit pool. This sends a bad message to those senior faculty as their salaries are not increased in alignment with their performance. Vice Provost Riffat noted that years in rank is considered in the equity review. Professor El-Ghazawi clarified that his point relates to merit assigned from the pool made available to the schools.

Professor Gupta observed that some outliers are not adjusted and keep returning as outliers in future analyses. He asked what is causing these repeat outliers. Vice Provost Riffat responded that the data from the last couple of years indicates that there are repeat outliers. Of this group, some are poor performers. In some cases, adjustments may be done over a two- to three-year period, causing the faculty member to reappear on the list of outliers until adjustments are fully completed. Professor Gupta suggested that perhaps those who are not being adjusted should be removed from pool and identified as continued outliers. Professor Wirtz respectfully disagreed, noting that a faculty member who has been routinely performing poorly and then decides to modify their behavior, that person should have an opportunity for re-assessment under the review process.

REPORT: Annual Report on Core Indicators (Chris Bracey, Provost)

The Provost's [full presentation](#) was distributed with the agenda for this meeting. He briefly reviewed the presentation before turning to questions. In his review, he highlighted a few particular areas:

- Students
 - Year over year, GW has increased the number of high-GPA students it is admitting; this is an indication that the university continues to improve academically, in terms of the quality of students matriculating.
 - The first-year retention rate continues to recover following the pandemic.
 - The number of students with majors in more than one school has declined, suggesting that, if GW wants to ensure that students are well-rounded academically and able to engage in cross-disciplinary analysis, the university may need to think more intentionally about including cross-disciplinary coursework within majors.
 - Students graduating with STEM majors peaked in 2020, and the distribution of majors at present highlights GW's strength in social science and policy as well as signaling a growth in STEM and GW's capacity to meet that demand when necessary.
 - The impact of the pandemic is still being seen in the 4- and 6-year graduation rates; improvement is expected with the class entering in 2021 because of their 90% first-year retention rate.
 - On the international front, the loss of Chinese students has been significant but has partially backfilled by students from India, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Azerbaijan, Egypt, Brazil, and Nigeria; much of this growth is happening in GW's graduate programs.
- Faculty
 - Since a 2018 peak, the university has seen growth in the non-tenured faculty category but a decline in the tenure-track faculty. Increasing tenure-track numbers is a function of the university's permanent resource base; as enrollments expand, the university will be in a position to invest more on the faculty side.
 - GW is performing well overall in terms of gender pay equity but does have some work to do in this area at the ranks of assistant and associate professor.
 - Staff support at GW is very lean, particularly in student support areas, as compared to market basket schools.

Professor Gupta referenced the decline in Regular Active Status faculty as a percentage of all faculty. This has been declining since 2018 and is currently below the Senate-endorsed commitment to a 75% level. He asked whether there is a plan to achieve this level of full-time staffing. The Provost responded that this decline is a function of the hiring freeze implemented during the pandemic and then a period of cautious rebuilding post-pandemic as enrollments rebounded. During that time, instead of committing to tenure lines, the Board limited authorized searches, and teaching needs led to higher contract hire numbers. GW will be in a position to recover in this area as it continues to emerge from the effects of the pandemic. Some adjustment is inevitable as contract lines roll off and tenure track lines are authorized. Professor Gupta asked whether the Board is willing to offer sufficient tenure lines to realize the 75% requirement. The Provost responded that the Board approves tenure searches with an eye on the consolidated margin at the end of the next fiscal year.

This is not a firmly knowable number, but the administration works to predict enrollments, net tuition revenue, and other elements to ensure that the schools can afford to pay the faculty members they hire. The consolidated margins have not been what the Board asked the leadership to produce, and this has slowed faculty and staff hiring as the university works to identify the most efficient uses of its current revenue.

Professor Wilson asked whether the university is able to assess high school grade inflation and the impact that has on enrolling better students. He also asked whether the fact that a number of prominent schools are reestablishing testing requirements will impact the students GW is able to enroll. The Provost responded that he does not know what the market is likely to hold with regard to test scores. With respect to high school grade inflation, he noted that high school GPA does seem to be a strong indication of student quality because of GW's solid retention rate. If enrolling students were not succeeding at GW, he would expect the first-year retention rate to be lower.

Professor Schultheiss observed that the faculty salaries in this presentation are reported as averages and asked why median is not used, noting that an average can be skewed by an outlier. This would suggest that perhaps the university's numbers are not as positive as the report might suggest. The Provost responded that averages are what is required for AAUP reporting. Cheryl Beil, Senior Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Assessment, noted that her office does use median data when comparing salaries with market basket schools.

Professor El-Ghazawi noted that SEAS has relatively small departments; when faculty retire, the robustness of the curriculum can be jeopardized in the absence of a policy to backfill those lines. He added that filling lines previously held by senior, high-salary faculty can be accomplished more economically with junior faculty. The Provost responded that the university does not have a policy for backfilling lines because enrollments fluctuate; the university wants to preserve flexibility, particularly around tenure lines. He noted that the deans are in conversation with department chairs in order to identify where there are program needs. The next step is to determine whether the school can afford what they're asking; then, a hiring proposal is brought to the Board. This is a very strategic and intentional process.

Professor Tschirhart asked whether there has been any effort to break down the high school GPA analysis by college and giving colleges the ability to look at this measure by program. This might provide useful information about where to make investments in program and teaching support. Dr. Beil noted that graduate programs can track this internally, but this is not tracked centrally at the undergraduate level.

Professor Feldman noted that faculty and students suffer from the current staffing situation. Understanding that this is resource dependent, she asked whether there is any intentional thinking about how to address this problem within the university's current resource constraints. The Provost responded that he discusses this often with the President and CFO. A major challenge is attrition; it is far more expensive to replace a staff member than to retain one, and the university is working on retention efforts for staff. The university leadership is very aware of the problem and is being strategic about where to allocate resources. Acknowledging that there are gaps and vacancies across the university, he noted that there are certain high-touch areas where the leadership knows it must make commitments including Counseling, Multicultural Student Services Center, and Disability Support Services. Another area of focus is academic advising; the university wants to reduce the

ratio of students to advisors in order to make the advising process more robust and less transactional; this will be a multi-year strategy.

Professor Wagner inquired about the drop in retention of Hispanic faculty; this is a sizable drop at a moment the university is trying to be intentional about hiring a diverse faculty. The Provost responded that this is part of why the Diversity Program Review is so important; there are some shifts that he can only see in retrospect. He noted that he was surprised by this number as well; it was trending up and turned negative in just one year. He noted that he will need to look at current practices and whether departments are doing the requisite levels of mentoring and the university is engaging in the necessary community elements that bond people to GW.

Professor Wilson asked why STEM majors are decreasing at GW while things like AI are emerging as growth areas. The Provost responded that the data show that more GW students over the past few years want to be doing social science and public policy. GW is fortunate to be a comprehensive university that can accommodate fluctuating demands. Dr. Beil added that many of GW's STEM students were international students, and those numbers have been lower in recent years.

Professor Parsons noted a paradox of the last decade in the decisions to make an aggressive push toward STEM majors while dropping a testing requirement; the implication would seem to be a student body less inclined toward STEM majors. The Provost responded that those two decisions were made by two different administrations (the test-optional decision preceded the next administration's decision to increase STEM majors).

Professor Brinkerhoff observed that, for both faculty and staff, retention is a key issue, and she hoped the administration recognizes that when the university loses people and does not backfill positions, morale plummets as those remaining are asked to do much more with less. If staff at GW are demoralized and see opportunities elsewhere in the region, this doesn't make for a positive working climate. She hoped that the university might consider messaging that gives the community confidence that this is a short-term issue and that they won't be indefinitely overburdened.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No new resolutions were introduced at the meeting.

GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Election of the Nominating Committee for the 2024-2025 Faculty Senate Executive Committee
The President noted that Professor Orti has agreed to chair the Nominating Committee. The slate was adopted by unanimous consent.
- II. Nominations for membership to Senate Standing Committees
Professor Susan Kulp (GWSB) was nominated for membership on PEAFF; her nomination was approved by unanimous consent.

Professor Wagner nominated Rachel Riedner (CCAS Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies) for membership on EPT as a nonvoting member; the nomination was approved by unanimous consent.

III. Senate Standing Committee Reports

No new standing committee reports have been received.

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Professor Wilson asked whether the Students for Justice in Palestine students suspended last semester remain suspended this term. Provost Bracey responded that the university does not comment on disciplinary cases. Ms. Anthony added that disciplinary outcomes for student organizations are posted on the student organization website on a semester basis.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:54pm.

Faculty Senate: President's Report March 1, 2024

It's been a busy couple of weeks since we last met, and I've had some great opportunities to meet with our GW community and talk with several of our university partners.

Last month, I made two trips to Florida. The first involved a Milken Institute session on the future of higher education that was held at a home in palm Beach and included the presidents of Brandeis University, Miami University, and the University of Utah, as well as myself, and one of the founders of the University of Austin. It was a lively conversation and very interesting to listen to the community's questions. My perception is that there is still broad recognition of the importance of higher education as well as questions around how we can make sure we are maintaining an environment of free and open discussion.

The second trip involved meeting with alumni and donors across the state, including Sarasota, Naples, Palm Beach, and Miami. This trip included two more of our GW Together events, where I was joined by Chair Speights, Trustees Ali Kolaghassi and Judith Rodgers, Dean Matthew, Donna Arbide, and many other university leaders for several intimate conversations with our robust alumni, donor, and family networks in the area. These meetings continue to be a good source of input and feedback from our broader alumni and parent community, and I have appreciated the opportunities to share some of the great work you all continue to do with them. Now, it's a short turnaround before I am off to Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle for the year's final three domestic GW Together events.

Over the last month, I was also able to attend some wonderful events on and around our campuses.

On Friday, February 9, I joined many from our GW community in celebrating the 2024 GW Athletics Hall of Fame inductees; former Board of Trustees Chair Russ Ramsey was inducted as part of the 1979 baseball team.

I also recently joined several students at the Mount Vernon estate to commemorate George Washington's birthday with a wreath-laying ceremony and to participate in a tribute to the enslaved community who were held there in bondage before, during, and after President Washington's lifetime.

Last month, our university was also recognized by the U.S. State Department and Secretary of State Antony Blinken as a top producer of Fulbright Scholars and students for the 2023-2024 academic year. Congratulations and thank you to all of you who were involved in applying for or receiving an award and those who supported student and colleague applicants.

Strengthening and enhancing our partnerships with the local community remains a key priority for me, and last week, I was pleased to join the ANC 2A meeting to introduce myself and discuss potential collaboration opportunities. Tomorrow, I will host several neighborhood partners at the GW Revs women's basketball game for a special Community Day event.

Earlier this week, I joined the Greater Washington Partnership annual CoLab meeting. This series of meetings brings together business and academic leaders to discuss how to collaborate better to meet the regional talent opportunities and develop the talent pipeline for today's and tomorrow's jobs.

Finally, I'm getting to know key partners in DC's academic and research ecosystem. Most recently, I've spent 1:1 time with the CEO of Phi Beta Kappa, Fred Lawrence, and the CEO of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), Sudip Parikh.

Next, it's been just over a month since we released GW's Plan to Strengthen our Community in Challenging Times, and I want to give you all a few updates on its implementation. As I mentioned when we launched the current plan, we intended for it to serve as a starting point, and it remains a work in progress. To that end, we have added a new intake form to the [plan website](#) to collect community suggestions and feedback. This input will be reviewed and vetted by the leadership working group that developed the plan and will be critical in supporting, expanding, and improving it. I encourage you all to submit your thoughts and feedback there.

We have also already hosted two of the plan's featured events. On February 12, the Law School hosted their panel discussion titled "Free Speech v. Hate Speech," in which First Amendment scholars debated where to draw the line in the context of all higher education. And on February 21, we hosted the second Sesno Series event titled "Disagree Better: How Politicians, the Public, and the Press Can Turn Down the Heat." This conversation featured Utah Governor Spencer J. Cox and media voices Jonah Goldberg and Michel Martin discussing how to bring healthy conflict back to politics and the media. A wonderful feature of both of the Sesno series talks is that the conversation is directed by video clips from interviews done with our students where they talk about how they see these issues. Frank Sesno then uses their comments to drive the interview with excellent results. We are always looking for new suggestions of events, topics, and ways to engage, and again, I encourage you to submit this on the website.

I know that many are curious to know what's happening with our review and harmonization of the university's policies and protocols. I can share today that Colette Coleman, our Dean of Students, and Charles Barber, our General Counsel, have already gathered a leadership working group and are developing a set of initial recommendations to clarify the existing policies that will soon go through a thorough review process that will include the relevant committees of the Faculty Senate.

We have some other new activities and initiatives planned around the various spring holidays, including our rescheduled interfaith dinner, and we look forward to sharing more details on these events in the coming days.

Next, you may recall that Aristide Collins departed the university last fall and is doing very well at Strada. I have been engaging in a search for a new Chief of Staff; I am getting close to making an offer and look forward to sharing with the Senate soon details about who will be taking that role.

Finally, as I mentioned at the last meeting, we are continuing to take the next steps in developing a strategic framework for the university, which will start with several future-focused conversations. We started these conversations last week, and I want to thank everyone who has attended so far and encourage those who have not to visit the Provost's website and [register for a session](#). I will let Provost Bracey tell you more about how this is progressing in just a moment.

Thank you, everyone. That concludes my report today, and I will open the floor to questions.



**Faculty Senate
Provost Report
Friday, March 1, 2024**

Good afternoon. You will be hearing from me quite a bit regarding Core Indicators in just a few moments, so I have just a few updates.

Strategic Framework Development & Future-Focused Conversation

As President Granberg has mentioned, the GW leadership team has been meeting with members of our community, including faculty, students, staff, alumni, and university partners, to identify GW's unique strengths and areas of opportunity. Throughout these engagements, it has become clear that our university is well-positioned to begin the development of a new strategic framework that can guide GW's future growth over the next five to ten years.

Before this formal framework development process can begin, it is important that we better understand the future for which we are planning and identify the challenges and opportunities higher education will face moving forward. To do this, we have begun a series of discussions on GW's future in the form of virtual conversations open to all members of the community. These one-hour dialogues focus on several key areas, including the future of work and the workforce, the future of higher education, and the future of knowledge. Members of the community have the opportunity to share their thoughts based on questions within these key areas.

We are simultaneously holding conversations with key leadership groups across the university.

Based on the themes that emerge from these conversations, GW leadership will produce a report that will be shared with the community for feedback and then presented to the GW Board of Trustees at the May 2024 meeting. Following the Board's review and endorsement of the report, the formal strategic framework development process will commence in the fall of 2024.

It is important to remember that these future-focused conversations are just the first step in a long-term process. Along the way, we are committed to providing multiple opportunities for the community to engage and share their thoughts, including an online webform for those who cannot attend one of the upcoming virtual sessions.

These conversations have begun in earnest, including several very productive conversations with our faculty this week, and we look forward to further engaging with the community in the coming months as we develop a strategic framework to move GW into the future.

I encourage you to visit the [Strategic Framework Development page](#) on the Provost site for information about registering for sessions, updates and more.

Diversity Summit

We held the 9th Annual Diversity Summit last week. The theme was “Defining Revolutionary: A Call for Justice, Liberation & Empathy.” On the opening night of the summit, I gave welcome remarks that emphasized the importance of events like the Diversity Summit in enabling the university to foster productive dialogue that features a range of diverse opinions, ideologies, identities, and experiences. I also noted that it is important for conversations that begin at an event like the Diversity Summit to continue after the event concludes, in order for the university to fulfill its holistic approach to providing a student learning experience premised upon inclusive excellence.

I am grateful to Caroline Laguerre-Brown and her office for their dedication to this annual event.

Global Food Institute/James Beard Foundation Report

Last week, the Global Food Institute (GFI) and the James Beard Foundation released a collaborative report that is the product of GFI's first research grant. The report illustrates how climate change is driving up costs for an already vulnerable restaurant industry, undermining the ability of chefs to meet consumers' expectations for high-quality affordable meals.

The report underpins a broader chef-led policy advocacy initiative launched by the James Beard Foundation, called “Climate Solutions for Restaurant Survival,” which aims to unite chefs across the country to raise awareness, educate federal policymakers, and galvanize action to mitigate the impacts of climate change.

The release of the report signals continued progress in GFI's commitment to finding solutions to the world's most urgent problems through the power of food, and we look forward to additional opportunities to showcase our research and policy expertise.

We published a [GW Today story about the report](#) this week, and you can find the report and a blog post written by Professor Tara Scully on the [Global Food Institute website](#).

Global Food Institute Reception

Also in Global Food Institute news, on Tuesday, GFI hosted a reception in City View Room following an event at the White House that announced new commitments in the “White House Challenge to End Hunger and Build Healthy Communities,” which launched last year. This challenge aims to end hunger and reduce diet-related diseases by 2030.

GW welcomed to the reception many congressional, state, and federal officials and representatives from food-focused organizations. José Andrés, founder of GFI, was in attendance to give remarks about the importance of implementing policy that will amplify the excellent work being done in communities to end hunger around the world.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) 2024 Annual Meeting

Finally, last week you may have seen a GW Today article about GW's attendance at the 2024 Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

AAAS is the world's largest, multi-disciplinary science society, and their annual meeting took place in mid-February in Denver. More than 4,500 attendees from 65 countries attend the meeting each year. They include leading scientists, students, government agencies, foundations and more.

Vice Provost Norris was in attendance, as well as multiple faculty who were participating in scientific sessions. All of them took time to meet attendees at the GW Research booth in the exhibit hall, and they had fruitful conversations with GW alumni and potential future students and collaborators.

Additionally, GW sponsored a workshop on how researchers can incorporate entrepreneurial thinking as they develop research questions and projects. This is a popular workshop that is offered monthly here by our Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship. I encourage you to check it out.

Next year's AAAS meeting will be held in Boston, and we hope to have a presence there as well. AAAS is currently seeking proposals for scientific sessions and workshops for its 2025 annual meeting. You can look for those details on the organization's website, and Vice Provost Norris will be promoting that opportunity soon as well.

President Granberg, this concludes my report.



Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)

March 1, 2024

Ilana Feldman, Chair

FSEC Activities

FSEC met on February 23 and spent much of this meeting in a wide-ranging, future-focused discussion around strategic planning with the President and Provost. This conversation represents one of the first such conversations the administration will be holding with university stakeholders to inform the identification of strategic pillars. Another such conversation will take place with the Educational Policy & Technology (EPT) committee next week.

The previously reported portal that will enable faculty to report any constraints on, or concerns about, their ability to exercise their academic freedom and use their expertise in the classroom and in their professional life [went live on the Senate website on Monday](#). The portal was announced to the full faculty via email that day. The chairs of FSEC and the Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEA) committee will be able to access portal submissions, and PEA's Academic Freedom subcommittee will review them to assess whether there are particular areas of concern requiring attention.

A summary of the February 1 joint meeting of FSEC and the Board Executive Committee is now [available on the Senate website](#).

Senate Elections

A quick reminder that the Faculty Organization Plan (FOP) requires that elections for Senate membership be completed by March 15 each year; election results should be reported out to the Senate Office as soon as possible.

Personnel Actions

There are no active grievances at the university.

Calendar

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is March 22, 2024. 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 March 15. The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting is April 12, 2024.

FACULTY SALARY EQUITY REVIEW: PROGRESS REPORT

Rumana Riffat
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Professor of Civil & Environmental Engineering

March 1, 2024

BACKGROUND: SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE AND METHODS

- ▶ Background: The Salary Equity Committee was first established and administered by VP for Academic Affairs Don Lehman; fresh look in 2018 under leadership of then-Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Chris Bracey
- ▶ Purpose: Advance the University's objective of ensuring that faculty salary allocations are based on legitimate factors
- ▶ Principal Task: Develop a reliable method of reviewing faculty salaries to initially identify potential salary "outliers"
- ▶ Follow-on Tasks performed by University Administrators within Provost's Office:
 - ▶ (1) Solicit from Deans any legitimate factors that may have contributed to any disparity or outlier status; and
 - ▶ (2) Work with schools to adjust salaries for faculty members where warranted

- ▶ Statistical Regression Analysis of Actual Salary by School* using September 2023 salary data

- ▶ Account for:
 - ▶ Department
 - ▶ Rank
 - ▶ Time in Rank

- ▶ Two Statistical Models
 - ▶ Full (inclusive of all regular faculty)
 - ▶ Excludes faculty hired with tenure

- ▶ Potential outliers = faculty salaries that are greater than one standard deviation from the regression curve

* CCAS divided into three cohorts: Physical Sciences, Social Sciences, Arts & Humanities

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

SALARY EQUITY REVIEW – CLEAN “DECODED” EXAMPLE ZOOM

1

GWID	First_Midd Last_Na	School1	RankClean	Department1	Yrs_in_Ran	Salary	Tenured_a	Full Model ZRE_1	Excluded Model ZRE_2	Intended Adjustment
Alex		VET MED	Professor	SMALL ANIMAL SPEC	6.33	104059.00	N	-2.20	-2.47	
Barbara		VET MED	Professor	SMALL ANIMAL SPEC	7.33	109123.00	N	-1.80	-2.01	
Charles		VET MED	Professor	SMALL ANIMAL SPEC	7.33	111800.00	N	-1.69	-1.89	
Dianne		VET MED	Professor	COMPARATIVE MEDIC	6.33	137098.00	N	-1.61	-0.71	
Eric		VET MED	Professor	DIAGNOSTIC AND POF	7.33	87541.00	Y	-1.33	#NULL!	
Francesca		VET MED	Professor	INFECTIOUS DISEASES	5.33	107026.00	N	-1.16	-0.29	
Gordon		VET MED	Professor	SMALL ANIMAL SPEC	11.33	110319.00	N	-0.96	-1.07	
Helen		VET MED	Professor	LARGE ANIMAL SPEC	5.33	102355.00	N	-0.95	-0.50	
Issac		VET MED	Professor	INFECTIOUS DISEASES	3.33	110150.00	Y	-0.94	#NULL!	
Joan		VET MED	Professor	INFECTIOUS DISEASES	10.50	119328.00	Y	-0.89	#NULL!	
Kurt		VET MED	Professor	DIAGNOSTIC AND POF	26.33	98272.54	N	-0.85	-0.87	
Leslie		VET MED	Associate P	DIAGNOSTIC AND POF	5.33	90848.00	N	-0.84	-0.94	
Mark		VET MED	Associate P	SMALL ANIMAL SPEC	1.33	80009.00	N	-0.82	-0.92	
Nicole		VET MED	Professor	INFECTIOUS DISEASES	10.50	121263.00	N	-0.82	-0.23	
Otis		VET MED	Associate P	DIAGNOSTIC AND POF	11.33	92875.00	N	-0.75	-0.84	
Petra		VET MED	Professor	INFECTIOUS DISEASES	10.50	126634.00	N	-0.60	0.02	
Quincy		VET MED	Professor	LARGE ANIMAL SPEC	10.50	117015.00	N	-0.56	-0.18	
Regina		VET MED	Professor	INFECTIOUS DISEASES	28.33	148498.00	N	-0.52	-1.00	

SALARY EQUITY REVIEW – UPDATE

- ▶ Sept. 2023 – SMHS (HS Only), SON and SPH
 - ▶ SMHS – 3 outliers, 1 adjustment
 - ▶ SON – 7 outliers; 3 adjustments
 - ▶ SPH – 14 outliers; 5 adjustments

- ▶ Sept. 2023– CCAS, ESIA, LAW, GWSB, GSEHD, SEAS (CPS excluded)
 - ▶ CCAS – 27 outliers (*10 Phys., 7 Soc., 10 Hum.); 4 adjustments
 - ▶ ESIA – 10 outliers; 5 adjustments
 - ▶ LAW – 7 outliers; 3 adjustments
 - ▶ GWSB – 7 outliers; 7 adjustments
 - ▶ GSEHD – 4 outliers; 5 adjustments
 - ▶ SEAS – 5 outliers; 4 adjustments

* CCAS divided into three cohorts: Physical Sciences, Social Sciences, Arts & Humanities

- ▶ Strategic Direction
 - ▶ Better understanding of the reasons for outlier status; build more complete picture
 - ▶ Improved mentorship/advocacy of department chairs and deans
 - ▶ Review methodology
 - ▶ Additional variables or complementary analyses