



# Faculty Senate

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SENATE MEETING  
HELD ON APRIL 12, 2024  
HYBRID: 1957 E STREET/STATE ROOM & WEBEX**

Present: President Granberg; Provost Bracey; Executive Committee Chair Feldman; Parliamentarian Binder; Registrar Cloud; Senate Office Staff Jenna Chaojareon; Deans Ayres, Bass, Goldman, Henry, and Wahlbeck; Professors Anenberg, Badie, Bamford, Briggs, Brinkerhoff, Clarke, Eakle, El-Ghazawi, Engel, Gore, Gupta, Gutman, Kargaltsev, Kay, Kramon, Kulp, Mahshie, Marvar, Mazhari, Orti, Parsons, Pittman, Rain, Sarkar, Schultheiss, Tielsch, Tschirhart, von Barghahn, Vyas, Wagner, Wilson, Wirtz, and Zeman.

Absent: Deans Feuer, Kelly-Weeder, Lach, Perry, and Riddle; Professors Borum, Callier, Kieff, Lu, Olesen, and Schwindt; Senate Office Staff Liz Carlson.

## CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:05p.m.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the March 1, 2024, Faculty Senate meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SENATE MEMBERS COMPLETING TERMS (Chris Bracey, Provost)

The Provost acknowledged the faculty senators who will be completing their terms at the end of the month.

From the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences:

- James Mahshie
- Mary Tschirhart
- Barbara von Barghahn

From the Graduate School of Education and Human Development:

- Delishia Pittman

From the Law School:

- Don Clarke

- Jeff Gutman
- Anne Olesen

From the Milken Institute School of Public Health:

- Susan Anenberg

And from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences:

- Ramesh Mazhari

Provost Bracey thanked all those named for their enthusiastic partnership and dedicated service to the university. This is a serious commitment on top of research and teaching duties, and everyone is deeply appreciative of all these faculty members do for GW.

[RESOLUTION 24/6: To Implement a Faculty Consultative Committee in Presidential Searches](#)  
(Guillermo Orti, Co-Chair, Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee)

Professor Orti introduced [Resolution 24/6](#), noting that it comes to the Senate from the Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) committee following a charge from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) to propose a modification of the Faculty Organization Plan (FOP) that would codify recent ad hoc processes into the formal establishment of a Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) for future presidential searches. This is a longstanding matter, with some of the language in the resolution dating back 38 years. Given the Faculty Code's limited direction on this matter, since 1986, ad hoc and one-time resolutions have been passed by the Faculty Assembly each time an FCC was formed. Professor Orti observed that, of course, everyone hopes this process will not need to be put into place for many years and that this is clearly not an urgent matter. However, the committee's sense is that it would be optimal to codify a process now, well ahead of when it will be needed.

PEAF reviewed the previous one-time solutions and came to consensus about a process for establishing an FCC in the present resolution. This process accounts for school representation and additional members to ensure a diverse FCC. PEAF also incorporated language for the FOP that requests that the FCC, upon its formation, ask the Board of Trustees for formal inclusion in the presidential search process. Professor Orti concluded his remarks by noting that he spoke with Professor Jim Tielsch (the Vice Chair of the last presidential search), Professor Kim Roddis (the chair of the FCC during the last presidential search), and Professor Gayle Wald (a faculty representative on the last search committee) to ensure that the process outlined in the current resolution is consistent with the experiences of the last search; all affirmed that it is.

Professor Feldman asked why the 1986 resolution isn't simply the way things are done, given that it was adopted by the Senate for the purpose of a presidential search. Professor Orti responded that the 1986 resolution, and each one following, was adopted for that particular search and not for future searches. The current resolution would enshrine a process in the FOP that would apply to all future presidential searches.

Professor Wirtz spoke in favor of the resolution but observed that he would prefer to see the Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (CCAS) representatives be representative of all three of its

divisions (physical sciences, social sciences, and humanities) to ensure a voice for each division, particularly the humanities, which has of late been frequently underrepresented. Professor Orti responded that he did not think that the Senate needed to specify how CCAS operates under these parameters and that the college should be trusted to take the need for diversity of disciplines (as well as ranks) into consideration when selecting their FCC representatives. Professor Wirtz noted that he was prepared to offer a minor amendment to the resolution on this matter but only if the CCAS members present were interested in this matter. Such an amendment would add the following to point 3 in the FOP amendment: “The three CCAS representatives shall be equally divided across the three CCAS divisions.”

Professor Gupta noted that he fully supports the resolution and will support the amendment when it comes to the floor. He added that he has been chairing the Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies (ASPP) committee for the last several years. A previous resolution on this matter from that committee asked for 18 representatives on the FCC; he was glad to see this number prevail in the current proposal. Additionally, noting that there are four members listed as additional members beyond the representatives in order to ensure diversity on the FCC, if Professor Wirtz’s amendment does not pass, these slots can include the humanities.

[Note: Technical issues in the State Room prevented in-person attendees from being hearing those speaking on the WebEx. Staff in the room asked that questions be sent to the chat to be conveyed to the State Room attendees.]

Professor Wirtz moved to amend the first resolving clause by adding “The three CCAS representatives shall be equally divided across the three CCAS divisions” to the end of Section 1, number 3. The motion was seconded.

Professor Wagner noted that a quick sidebar with the CCAS Senate members in the room finds support for this amendment. The College did a good job managing the discipline balance internally for the most recent search, but the CCAS senators like the idea of protecting the humanities, given that no one knows what the environment will look like when another search takes place many years from now.

Professor Tielsch asked what might happen if the number of divisions in CCAS changes at some point. Professor Gupta suggested, as a solution, dropping the references to numbers in the amendment text so that the amendment simply states that the CCAS representatives will be equally distributed across the CCAS divisions. This would eliminate any issues around future changes to the number of CCAS divisions.

Professor El-Ghazawi noted that it is a happy accident that the number of CCAS divisions aligns with the number of CCAS representatives on the FCC. The intent of the resolution from the beginning was to blindly divide the Senate membership by four and rounding to get to the FCC number, creating a logical conflict. With this being said, he suggested encouraging the school to balance its FCC membership across its divisions without specifying the numbers.

Professor Wirtz indicated that he was not inclined to accept this suggestion as a friendly amendment to his amendment, noting that none of the numbers divide evenly. Should something change related to the number of CCAS divisions, there would need to be a sizable approval process including an FOP amendment and an approval process through the Senate and the Board. He stated he would be

fine with Professor Gupta's suggestion to remove the number "three" from his amendment if this is the Senate's preference; there should be some teeth in this statement by stating at least that CCAS must diversify its FCC membership across its divisions.

Professor Brinkerhoff suggested another option for amending the amendment, such that FCC membership should be divided as equally as possible across the CCAS divisions—without exceeding its three representatives—in order to avoid the possibility of an incentive to add divisions.

Provost Bracey asked Professor Gupta to restate his friendly amendment; Professor Gupta responded that his suggestion would strike the "three" referenced twice in Professor Wirtz's amendment. Professor Wirtz stated that he would accept this amendment. The amendment would then read "The CCAS representatives shall be equally divided across the CCAS divisions." The amendment to Professor Wirtz's amendment was adopted by unanimous consent. Professor Brinkerhoff withdrew her friendly amendment. Professor Wirtz's amendment was adopted by unanimous consent.

Professor Orti offered a technical amendment to correct article and section designations; this was offered due to the fact that there were slight errors in the language in Resolving Clause 1 that refers to FOP Article numbers. He moved a technical amendment to allow the Faculty Senate office to correct these technical errors prior to finalizing the adopted resolution. The amendment was adopted by unanimous consent.

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 23-4.

#### [PROVOST'S REPORT](#) (Chris Bracey, Provost)

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

#### [BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PROVOST'S REPORT](#)

Professor Wilson asked whether the Diversity Program Review report will be shared with the Senate. The Provost responded that he needs to complete his review of the report to determine whether it can be shared and in what capacity, as he does not yet know what it contains. Professor Wagner observed that it would be extremely helpful for Senate members to see the report prior to the April 19 Senate/administration retreat around strategic planning, as the report's recommendations are critical to this conversation. The Provost noted that he would take this under advisement.

Professor Wagner, noting that she recently received a communication from a CCAS faculty member, asked about the status of CCAS budget restrictions and whether there is a plan for the remainder of the current year and for next year to make the faculty and graduate students whole with regard to scholarly travel expenses. This is a point of recruitment but is also absolutely necessary for graduate students and faculty, who are mentoring those students, to get to conferences. A competitive fund can't meet these needs, and she asked what the plan is to be sure that the school can be competitive.

The Provost responded that this is something GW leadership has thought very intentionally about during the budgetary process. It has been made very clear to the unit leaders that they need to prioritize funding for these types of activities to drive the research agenda forward for the university. In addition, there are dedicated funds in the Provost division to provide additional support for graduate students in particular. As the budget process proceeds, he stressed that unit leaders are being asked to prioritize this to avoid a repeat of what happened this year. Vice Provost for Research Norris noted that there is a second competition for OVPR funds being run by Gina Lohr (Senior Associate Vice Provost for Research and Administrative Dean) that can be pursued for these activities.

Professor Brinkerhoff added that she hoped the planning and messaging around funding for conference travel, particularly that from the Provost's office and the unit leaders, would provide ample understanding of what funds will be available. She noted that it was pointed out in an Elliott School (ESIA) faculty meeting that a lot of lead team would be required on funding availability as conference proposals have to be submitted very early. If faculty and graduate students don't know in advance that their travel expenses will be covered, there is a disincentive for them to submit those proposals, which defeats the whole purpose of making sure the funds are available. The Provost responded that once the Board approves the budget for the coming fiscal year, his office will be able to notify the deans, who can then communicate details within their schools.

Professor Pittman (Graduate School of Education & Human Development (GSEHD), Department of Counseling & Human Development) noted that her department recently received the school's tuition structure for the upcoming academic year. While recognizing that the program enjoys robust applications, she relayed a concern that the program is now approximately \$600/credit hour more expensive than its regional competitors in its on-campus graduate programs. These are 60-credit hour masters programs as required by accreditation. Program faculty are concerned about the viability, sustainability, and quality of program delivery as well as the ability to recruit and retain top students for graduate programs who are being asked to pay \$1925/credit hour for programs that anticipate starting salaries in the high \$40K range. She asked whether the Provost could provide any information to take back to GSEHD faculty and students who are concerned about the impact that continued tuition increases will have on the program's ability to enroll diverse students who are diversifying the pipeline and service delivery in mental health.

The Provost responded that every spring, planning meetings are held with all the division leaders, the deans, the finance directors, and representatives from the Provost's office and Budget office. This group works through a strategy for pricing rates. The conversation held with GSEHD leadership resulted in the pricing schedule Professor Pittman referenced. He encouraged her to speak with her dean to learn about the strategy that underlies the final numbers, noting that there is a great deal of thought and effort that goes into what is presented for consideration.

Professor Pittman responded that the faculty have spoken with their dean and have received the response that the decision is made at the Provost level. She noted that faculty have requested the insights the Provost referenced, have advocated for their students at the department level, and have shared this feedback with the dean through their department chair, all to no avail. Faculty are not receiving any information about the underlying strategy guiding the continued increase in the department's price point. The Provost responded that he would sit down with Dean Feuer to understand what is happening and would then either respond directly to Professor Pittman or have

Dean Feuer do so. He expressed that he hears her concerns and feels she is entitled to some explanation, particularly if concerns have already been articulated to the leadership within the school.

#### PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Ellen Granberg, President)

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

#### BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Professor Wirtz observed that CFO Fernandes is doing excellent work in terms of keeping the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting (FPB) committee aware of the ongoing efforts regarding the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA). However, he noted that there are issues he suspected are beyond the CFO's level that he understood to involve initiatives under consideration by the Board of Trustees to try and deal with this serious situation. He asked whether the President could advise the Senate on where the MFA situation stands and what the Board is doing about it.

President Granberg responded that the Board is keeping very close tabs on all that is happening. They have delegated to the university leadership the responsibility for determining the path forward. She noted that, when there is information ready to share, it will be shared with the Senate. Understanding that this can be frustrating to hear, she stated that she is not comfortable sharing in this meeting information that has not yet been shared with the Board. She agreed that this is a serious situation that requires the leadership's and the Board's full attention, which it has.

Professor Wirtz observed that the issue with the redesigned FAFSA is a serious situation around the country. He wondered about the extent to which GW has recognized the gravity of the matter by trying to get as many people on board as possible now by admitting more from the waitlist than would be usual at this point in the admissions cycle, recognizing that there might well be a shortfall in the fall if action isn't taken now. President Granberg deferred to Vice Provost Jay Goff or Provost Bracey, who have been deeply involved in crafting both the strategy and implementation in this regard. The Provost noted that he and Vice Provost Goff had a conversation about the FAFSA challenges and what the enrollment office is doing to address those. The Provost preferred to defer to Vice Provost Goff for an answer to this question, as he is most directly involved with these efforts. Vice Provost Goff was not able to comment in the meeting due to technical issues; the Provost indicated a response would be provided at a later time.

Professor Schultheiss relayed concerns about philanthropy she has heard from a number of CCAS chairs. Namely, it appears that funds donated to a specific department are apparently rolling back to CCAS at the end of the fiscal year. This is very concerning for both donors and departments; she asked whether the President was aware of this issue. President Granberg and Provost Bracey responded that they had not heard about this issue previously. After being asked if others had comments on this, Professor Tschirhart responded that, as the director of the Trachtenberg School, she was told there is uncertainty about reserves in the R fund, despite what she thought was in place for the Trachtenberg School. Even around Giving Day, there is some question about use of donated funds this year and what portion could be allocated by the Trachtenberg School for new uses versus CCAS more generally, and whether they could be saved and used next year. She stated she would like to get more of a sense of whether this is a university or college policy around these designations.

President Granberg and CFO Fernandes indicated they were not aware of anything at the university level driving this and noted they would look into the issue.

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (Ilana Feldman, Chair)

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

### BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

None.

### REPORT: The Role & Composition of the Executive Committee with Recommendations (Guillermo Orti, Co-Chair, Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee)

Professor Orti provided a brief summary of [the full report](#), which was circulated with the agenda and is also posted on the PEAFF section of the Senate website. The report comes in response to a charge from FSEC to “consider how best FSEC can contribute to supporting shared governance at the university and, particularly, to putting the Senate in the best position to work effectively with a new president...consider whether any amendments to governing documents are necessary to support FSEC’s effective functioning and/or whether an elaboration or consensus interpretation of these documents will suffice.” The circulated report reviews the history of events motivating FSEC’s charge to PEAFF as well as some interpretation of those events and their consequences.

PEAFF finds that FSEC is not a representative body of the faculty—for example, CCAS is underrepresented, as are faculty with direct contact with undergraduate students. The report also makes some observations about the current governing documents of the faculty (the Faculty Code and the FOP), including the functional differences set out between FSEC and the Senate’s standing committees. The report also addresses an issue of representation around the regular joint meetings between FSEC and the Board’s Executive Committee in light of FSEC’s underrepresentation of the faculty as a whole. Finally, the report offers some recommendations for possible future actions. He welcomed questions or suggestions for the committee for future work on this issue.

Professor Feldman thanked the committee for their hard work on this report. She noted that there is a similar issue with CCAS Senate representation as was noted on the resolution adopted earlier in this meeting and wondered if Senate election procedures might need to be revised in order to send more diverse representation to the Senate from CCAS. This has a direct impact on CCAS’s FSEC representation as the CCAS Senate membership is the group coming to consensus about who its FSEC representative will be. These issues may require solutions beyond the particular concerns raised about how to structure FSEC.

Professor Feldman also provided some thoughts on the report’s recommendations. Having some years of experience on the Senate now, she observed that the idea of having a faculty-wide election of a faculty president (as opposed to the FSEC chair) is a potentially valuable idea. As the FSEC chair, she noted that she is very aware in the meetings that include the FSEC chair, that the Senate is structurally very differently represented than other bodies. The students have a student president

who represents the students, and the FSEC chair is not serving in a parallel role. The FSEC chair can report on what the Senate is doing but doesn't have the same kind of representative role; the Senate is therefore somewhat underserved by its own structure. If the faculty were to move toward having the suggested "president" role, however, they would need to elaborate what that role would constitute, such as what kind of representative functions it might have; this would require further elaboration.

She observed that some of the other suggestions in the report strike her as exceedingly complicated where simplicity will serve better, leading her to a more cautious response. She also expressed concerns about the idea of a recall procedure, wondering if this might set the Senate up for negative interpersonal relationships among Senate members if people are recalling each other.

Professor Tielsch thanked PEAF for their hard work on this important report. He noted that, at present, even the Senate cannot claim that it is representative, as it does not have the metric to decide eligibility by school and the numbers of faculty who should represent each school on the Senate. This is only occasionally updated. He suggested that the committee think about whether there might be an algorithm for calculating exactly the number of Senate representatives from each school. Second, he expressed that it would be important, if the Senate wants to ensure diversity, that it has some concept of what the necessary characteristics of diversity would be. For example, the divisions within CCAS might be one characteristic, as might clinical sciences and basic sciences within the School of Medicine & Health Sciences (SMHS). Today's report represents a very good starting point for an important set of discussions.

Professor Wirtz echoed previous compliments to the committee. This is a thorough report, and the Senate needs to take time to digest it and determine next steps. Having served on FSEC for several years over multiple sessions, he issued a very carefully worded caveat. Serving on FSEC is an exceedingly difficult job; those who have not served on FSEC may not fully appreciate how difficult it is and how many tricky decisions FSEC members have to make. He agreed that a mistake was made regarding the timeline and communication requests around the decision to arm the GWPD. While unfortunate, this type of mistake was bound to happen sooner or later, in view of the fact that FSEC does so often consider issues that have to be interpreted very carefully.

With that said, he also recognized that there are situations where sensitive matters need to be discussed in FSEC that really cannot be shared widely. He was struck by the language in part of the report stating that "FSEC may not receive information that it does not pass on to the bodies that are deemed by the faculty to be competent." This is an exceedingly strong statement, and Professor Wirtz noted that he did not find it a wise course of action. There are situations where FSEC really does need to be informed and really cannot pass that information along at that moment—he noted he would not include the decision to arm GWPD as an example of that. However, he worried that some may think that FSEC is not taking these matters seriously or thinking them out and makes a blanket decision not to tell anyone about its conversations. This is not the way FSEC works. It is an exceedingly deliberative body that works very hard—obviously uncompensated—and is deserving of thanks for their service in a difficult job.

That having been said, Professor Wirtz offered some counsel to the administration. Noting that he was certainly not referencing the current administration, he noted that the previous administration did set things up in such a way that FSEC was pitted against the faculty. In many ways, the thought was that FSEC should simply represent the faculty and that, by coming to FSEC, the administration



had come to the faculty. In some sense, FSEC “got played” by the previous administration. He hoped that the administration understands that this is not a role FSEC can play. They cannot represent the faculty and are not to be thought of as the group to be consulted as a representative body of the faculty. It is largely because FSEC was put in such an untenable position by the previous administration that GW ended up with the GWPD policy situation. This is a tricky line to walk.

In responding to Professor Tielsch’s point, which he fully understands, Professor Wirtz noted that the Senate has never fully come to grips with the fact that the Faculty Senate is comparable in its composition to the US Senate and not to the US House of Representatives. He assumed that the framers of the FOP recognized that fact by allowing one vote for each school (with CCAS at the time basically viewed as three schools via its three divisions). Viewing the Senate as a house of representatives would be a sizable change for the Senate, in effect ensuring that the biggest school wins or dominates. He encouraged the group to consider whether this is what they want for their Faculty Senate.

Professor El-Ghazawi agreed with previous speakers that this is a very thorough report that looks at a number of possibilities and different ways of providing new structures or mechanisms. The issue around the arming of GWPD was a very emotional issue with many people feeling strongly about each side, perhaps creating a more charged atmosphere around the reaction to FSEC’s discussions with the administration. Second, he observed that the Board has expressed in the past that, if there isn’t a mechanism to create a sounding board and discuss matters with the faculty in an informal and sometimes confidential way, they may be more reluctant to share more of what they are doing; this is its own concern.

Professor Wilson observed that there was a problem some years ago with the Senate and the trustees not talking to each other, and this was a problem for the university. One of the innovations coming out of the effort to define shared governance at GW was that meetings between FSEC and the Board’s executive committee would take place periodically. These meetings are very important and should continue. With that said, every member of the faculty also has the right to provide opinions to anyone who asks, including the trustees; this should extend to FSEC. There is a difference between being representative in the sense that is usually meant and being able to give advice. A problem arises when the group asking for that advice turns around and calls that full consultation or endorsement.

Professor Orti thanked everyone for their comments and acknowledgments. The joint executive committee meetings are indeed important and have as a main goal to build more trust between the Board and the faculty; that trust has historically been very low. Rebuilding that trust is fundamental for the well functioning of the university and its community. Trust is a crisis today on a global level, and, at the university level, recent work has been done to strengthen trust among the faculty, Board, and administration. What FSEC cannot do, however, is talk to the Board as though it represents the faculty as a whole; it cannot claim to represent the whole broad expertise that exists within the GW faculty. He noted that he is privileged to be part of these meetings as a member of FSEC, exchanging ideas with colleagues and the Board. But this is not done with the idea that he is representing the faculty as a whole.

The issue is therefore how to interpret these conversations. Are they pieces of advice given by faculty to the Board, or are they conversations with certain faculty members who happen to be serving at that moment with the best intentions?

Professor Wilson agreed but wondered if he happened to be walking down 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and met a trustee who asked a question, would he have to convey the substance of that conversation to the Senate? Generally, this does not seem like a good idea. Professor Orti noted that, if an issue comes up in such a conversation, and he doesn't have the answer, he can say he will bring this great question to a relevant committee who has the expertise. Then another conversation can be held to reach some reasonable conclusions.

Professor Feldman noted that the joint FSEC/Board Executive Committee meetings are still a fairly new process. It has been beneficial thus far in just getting people who weren't previously in conversation together into dialogue. She reminded the group that it is standard practice to prepare a report of the conversation for the Senate and post that to the Senate website, which is public. This report does not attribute comments to any individual person as it is trying simply to convey a sense of what was covered.

There is a careful balance to strike around representativeness. The Senate's structure is not perfectly representative, and this is the ground from which the Senate work starts. If there is too much seeking out which components of the Senate are more representative, and by extension more legitimate, trouble arises. The heart of the Senate is its committees. They are not representative or even populated primarily by Senate members in many cases. In an effort to attain a formula of representativeness, it would not be desirable to have committees be elected; this would discourage the kind of service that is absolutely vital to the work of shared governance. The committees are made up of volunteers who care about the issues and want to lend their time and any relevant expertise to the committees' work. She cautioned the group against elevating the word "representative" to something that can be resolved in a highly legalistic way that would actually render all parts of the Senate unable to do the work everyone hopes they will do.

Professor Parsons noted that everything flows from the Faculty Assembly, which is itself representative on a 1:1 basis. Over the past 25 years, there have been several issues that pushed the question of the Senate and how representative it should be. Serious attempts over the years were not adopted because smaller schools were not interested in yielding power to CCAS because of its size. There is not a representative ideal but rather a governance ideal.

Professor Briggs cautioned that the document as presented with recommendations is highly prescriptive and ties the hands of FSEC completely. For example, based on her reading of the report, even creating agendas for FSEC meetings is taken out of FSEC's hands. The beauty of FSEC is that each school is represented and has a voice; members do try to share the perspectives of their own faculties with the President and the Provost in FSEC meetings and the Board in the joint executive committee meetings. There is more communication that can happen at that level than what is possible when bringing a group of 25-30 people to a meeting with the Board Executive Committee; the latter is somewhat unwieldy on a regular basis.

As FSEC meets monthly, it is trying to bring forth the work of the standing committees in a reasonable manner and is devoting hours of time to these efforts. The report's recommendations, however, basically tell FSEC that they might as well not be there at all. She expressed concern that the schools will lose some degree of ability to communicate with the administration and others if these recommendations are adopted.

Professor Wagner noted that this report does some great work showing the group what has occurred and a potential route forward. It would be unwise not to pay attention to it and the events that prompted it. When joining the Senate in 2018, she had no idea of the relationship between the Senate and FSEC and the ways in which FSEC was or was not (and however intentionally or not) being put in a position to speak for the faculty. This document provides suggestions for the Senate to be aware of for FSEC. For those who are being onboarded, there are important questions to understand about FSEC's obligations, responsibilities, and protections against its misuse. She sees this as part of a conversation born several years ago when the administration did not follow the tenets of shared governance. The process is not perfect, and the group needs to continue to think intentionally about these issues.

Professor Bamford noted that she believes many members of the faculty have no idea what FSEC is—that it exists or what its functions are—and some of the points in the report are getting at that. The report does not just have to be an issue of representation; education on this could go a long way, including reaching out to Senate members who would eventually like to serve on FSEC.

Professor Brinkerhoff observed that the Senate comes to this conversation with a good deal of broken trust. A lot of that has been between the Board and the faculty. However, what is really under discussion today is trust between the Senate and FSEC. Having more documentation that is very clear about the specific role that FSEC plays is important. Trust can be fixed over time with continued socialization and conversation around the shared values between the Senate, FSEC, and the faculty. She noted that less is more and that she is very sympathetic to the many points raised today about times when information is perhaps not immediately shareable. It is not possible to foresee what complex issues may come down the pike that require more discretion. She stated that she is willing to trust her colleagues to understand the difference. The major breach that occurred last year was with the Board trying to use FSEC as their tool. With that experience, expectations can be set and language created, socializing all involved into a process that will prevent a recurrence of that event.

## INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No new resolutions were introduced at the meeting.

## GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Nominations for membership to Senate Standing Committees  
None were offered at today's meeting. Committee rosters for the 2024-2025 session will be presented for approval at the May Senate meeting.
- II. Senate Standing Committee Reports  
The following reports have been filed with the Senate office and have been posted to the Senate website on the relevant committee pages:
  - [Fiscal Planning & Budget Committee Annual Report](#)
  - [Physical Facilities & Campus Safety Annual Report](#)
  - [Academic Freedom Portal Report \(Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom\)](#)

## BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

None.

## ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn to executive session for the purpose of approving the brief minutes from the two 2023-2024 executive sessions. The motion includes the deans, CFO Fernandes, and General Counsel Barber in attendance. The motion was approved by unanimous consent.

The open session was adjourned at 3:59pm.



**Faculty Senate: Provost Report**  
**Friday, April 12, 2024**

The end of the semester is rapidly approaching, with the last day of classes just a few weeks away. I encourage you all to continue devoting your energies to supporting our students and helping them stay focused while they work toward the finish line, and please remember to continue looking after yourselves as well during this busy time of year.

I have several updates to share today.

*Strategic Framework Update*

First, an update on where we are in the pre-work phase of our strategic framework development process.

As you know, in February and March, we held a series of future-focused conversations that marked the first step in a strategic framework development process that will guide the university's growth in the coming years. The conversations, intended for us to understand the future into which GW is planning, tailored questions for students, faculty, staff, and alumni around the key areas of the future of the workforce and work, the future of higher education, and the future of knowledge.

I am pleased to share that a summary report of these conversations, plus feedback that was submitted online, will be distributed to the community in the very near future. The report summarizes the information we learned and hopefully begins to bring into focus the major ideas and commonalities expressed among constituencies. The Faculty Senate will receive the report today and leadership will meet with the Senate next week to talk further on this topic.

When the report is distributed to the community, we will post a web form that the community can use to submit thoughts about the report. This feedback will provide additional helpful context as we begin to distill the many exciting and insightful ideas we have learned into a set of themes that will inform the university's strategic framework in the coming academic year.

Whether you joined a conversation or submitted feedback online, I deeply appreciate your engagement with this advance work.

*Diversity Program Review Report*

The Provost Office has received the Diversity Program Review Team's final report, which is the culmination of collaboration and dedication from individuals across our university community. It provides a review of GW's strengths, areas of opportunity, and recommendations aimed at fostering a more inclusive, equitable, and enjoyable environment for the GW community. I look forward to reviewing this action plan, following up with stakeholder groups, and sharing next steps with the community.

I would like to thank Vice Provost Caroline Laguerre-Brown, Associate Vice Provost Jordan West, and all the members of the Diversity Program Review Team sub-groups, who have put tremendous effort into getting this report over the finish line.

*GWALA*

The fourth cohort of the GW Academic Leadership Academy, or GWALA, graduated just a few short hours ago. You may recall that I created this program in 2019 with then-Provost Forrest Maltzman to enable our academic leaders to step

outside their day-to-day functions and dedicate time to professional development, relationship-building, and enhancing their skill sets. I am grateful to Associate Provost Jeff Brand and Sara Melita for facilitating this important initiative.

Of course, we have a number of end-of-year events on the horizon.

### *Commencement*

The countdown to Commencement continues! Hopefully, you saw a note from me encouraging you to register for Commencement Week activities, including school celebrations and Commencement on the National Mall on Sunday, May 19. A strong faculty showing at graduation events demonstrates to our graduating students and their families and friends that we are proud to see them cross the finish line and are excited about their future endeavors, so I encourage you to register if you have not yet done so. Registration details are available on the [Commencement website](#), and faculty registration will close on Friday, May 3.

### *Academic Honors and Faculty Honors Ceremonies*

We are also looking forward to our annual celebrations of student, faculty, and graduate teaching assistant achievement. The Academic Honors ceremony, which recognizes each school's Distinguished Scholars as well as their Outstanding Academic Achievement Award recipients, will take place next week on April 18. The 14<sup>th</sup> Annual Faculty Honors Ceremony will take place on April 23. All are welcome to the Faculty Honors Ceremony, so please [register](#) if you have not yet done so.

### *Interfaith Week*

You should have received infomails promoting Interfaith Week, which takes place next week from April 15-19. It is an exploration and celebration of the many religious and spiritual communities that are an integral part of the GW community, and all are welcome to attend the many events on the calendar. I invite you to visit the [Office for Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement website](#) to view the schedule. President Granberg and I look forward to attending the Interfaith Dinner on the evening of April 18.

### *Celebration of the GW Alliance for a Sustainable Future*

Finally, we are also looking forward to next week's celebration of the [GW Alliance for a Sustainable Future](#). You will recall that the alliance launched in November, led by executive director Frank Sesno. On April 17, we will celebrate the creativity, scholarship and leadership that is working to advance a more sustainable way of life for the health of our planet. The program will include a roundtable discussion with GW faculty experts; a keynote conversation with Delaware senator Chris Coons, the co-founder and co-chair of the bipartisan Senate Climate Solutions Caucus; and the East Coast premiere of Sacred Place, a choral work celebrating our relationship with the earth. This performance will feature the University Singers and vocal and instrumental soloists, led by Corcoran faculty member Erin Freeman. I encourage you all to register for and attend this exciting event.

This concludes my report, and I will open the floor to questions.

## Faculty Senate Meeting: President's Report April 12, 2024

Hello, and good afternoon, everyone. I hope you all had a wonderful spring break and your preparations for the end of the semester are going well. I want to start today by echoing Provost Bracey's thanks to our departing senators. Thank you all for your time, dedication, and continued support of GW and its mission.

### Meetings and Events

The start of spring has brought a flurry of activity and engagement across our campuses, including a number of events that have showcased the breadth of expertise and achievements at GW. I want to highlight just a few for you this afternoon.

In March, we hosted a live taping of the popular radio show "Science Friday" with some of the nation's leading scientists and scholars from our university and other institutions across the District. I had the pleasure of attending that event, and Lisner Hall was completely packed; it was a great night. Just a week later, the GW School of Business brought together the nation's top business, policy, and industry leaders for this year's Business and Policy Forum to discuss AI and the opportunities and implications of these emerging technologies.

On April 3 and 4, we celebrated GW Giving Day. Over the course of 24 hours, nearly 3,500 individuals from all 50 states and almost a dozen countries donated gifts totaling more than \$1.8 million—the most in our university's history. We also had nearly 3500 donors. And soon after, we continued our celebration of philanthropy at GW with this year's Celebration of Scholarships and Fellowships, which recognized and honored our many donors and the students who have benefited from their generosity.

I've also had several opportunities to meet with the broader GW community and our colleagues across higher education. Soon after the last Faculty Senate meeting, I attended the American Council on Education's Presidents and Chancellors Summit here in DC. Then, I was on the road again, heading to the West Coast for the final three GW Together events. We spent time in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle, and I was so impressed with the strong GW presence in each city. The entire GW Together tour has been a great way to get to know our alumni, families, and donors better and has produced many helpful insights and conversations.

Finally, last week, I attended the 2024 Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Awards. These awards, founded by longtime GW supporter Calvin Cafritz, recognize exceptionally dedicated DC Government employees. It was a pleasure to join our partners from across the District in recognizing those who have gone above and beyond to make Washington, DC, a better place to live, work, learn, and visit. This is an event that we have hosted on campus for a number of years, and it was a pleasure to host this year's event.

### University Updates

Now, I want to provide a few updates on university business, initiatives, and activities.

Regarding our budget, we have completed the spring planning meetings with all the schools and divisions, and we are now working on the final phases of consolidating the 2025 budget. As we've discussed, we continue to target a budget that allows us to make certain strategic investments and investments in our faculty and staff while also targeting a reasonable surplus.

As for enrollment, we remain on track to meet our expectations and targets for both the Spring and Fall 2024 semesters.

Increases in new undergraduate student success rates continue this year, with over 98 percent of the Fall 2023 first-year undergraduates returning for the spring semester. This achievement marks one of GW's all-time high fall-to-spring persistence rates, and it serves as a positive indicator that student retention rates are steadily returning to pre-pandemic levels.

Our undergraduate admissions team sent our first-year class admission letters and estimated financial packages on March 25. As in years past, we have a very healthy wait list built up, allowing us to ensure we meet our class size for the year ahead. I particularly want to thank Jay Goff and his team. I think everyone here knows about the difficulties with the FAFSA data, and they have done an incredible job of modeling our financial offers so that we were able to get them out to students on time.

Starting this week, you may have noticed a busier-than-normal campus as we kicked off Inside GW Student Days. Over 6,000 admitted students and their families are expected to visit for the event this month. When you combine that with all our other tours and offerings, we anticipate welcoming over 50,000 campus visitors to GW in 2024.

And speaking of newly admitted students, on March 7, I was thrilled to participate in my very first SJT Scholars Day at GW! Most of you know that this is a full scholarship that we give to ten District high school students each year; this was a day where we traveled from high school to high school to let students know that they were receiving this scholarship. It was an amazing experience—I had heard about it and had seen videos of it from previous years, and it exceeded all of my expectations. It was particularly touching and affecting for me to meet some of the parents and families of our new SJT scholars.

Next, I have two staffing updates to share with you. First, earlier this year, Sharon Reich Paulsen notified me that she would be stepping down as GW's Executive Vice President and Chief Administration Officer to return to the law and legal academia, where she has spent much of her career. Bruno Fernandes has assumed the responsibilities previously under Sharon's purview, and they have fully transitioned the administrative operations, including our safety and security organization. As a part of this transition, our Associate Vice President for Facilities, Construction, and Management, Baxter Goodly, is serving as the Interim Vice President for Safety and Facilities.

Next, I am happy to announce that after completing a competitive national search, we have named Scott Mory as Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff. With decades of experience as a dynamic leader in higher education and a deep-rooted connection to GW, Scott brings a unique perspective to our institution, and will be a critical strategic partner to me and our executive leadership team. Scott currently serves as Carnegie Mellon University's vice president for university advancement and will begin his tenure at GW on July 1.

Finally, I want to update you on our progress in arming GW Police Department officers. After conferring with the GW community, we have appointed 16 representatives from our faculty, staff, student body, and local community to serve on the GW Campus Safety Advisory Committee envisioned in our implementation plan. These members were notified last week and are scheduled to convene for the first time in late April. A full list of committee members can be found on the [Campus Safety Advisory Committee website](#), hosted by GW Safety. We are also beginning the process of confirming that all required certifications and training are completed for officers included in Phase 3 of the implementation process. Once the Campus Safety Advisory Committee convenes in April and we confirm that all Phase 3 participants have met their requirements, we will proceed with arming these officers and completing the implementation process.

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





# Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)

April 12, 2024

Ilana Feldman, Chair

## FSEC Activities

FSEC met on March 22 and discussed the future-oriented discussions with faculty, students, staff, and alumni that have taken place in preparation for strategic planning. The upcoming Faculty Senate retreat on April 19 will be an opportunity for Senators to reflect on, and contribute to, the themes that are emerging from those conversations. All Senators are encouraged to participate in the retreat.

The Parliamentarian also advised FSEC on two matters: its agenda-setting role and executive sessions.

On FSEC's agenda-setting role, the Parliamentarian addressed the limits of FSEC's ability to "arrange" the agenda, advising that FSEC is not a gatekeeper, nor a traffic cop but is, rather, closer to a crossing guard. FSEC can informally make suggestions to a reporting committee about potential concerns about a resolution (either raised by FSEC or by another committee), but FSEC does not have the formal authority to return a resolution to committee. FSEC does have some flexibility in terms of which meeting a resolution is scheduled for, within reason, based on the size of the agenda at the next meeting.

With regard to what happens when two committees want to weigh in on a matter, the Parliamentarian advised that it is important for FSEC to avoid formally involving two committees. If an issue crosses committee boundaries, collaboration needs to be worked out informally, with one committee receiving formal directions from FSEC. If a committee generates a resolution and then finds another committee wants to weigh in, it's smart for the original committee to confer with the other committee; however, there is no formal requirement that this take place--and no formal ability of FSEC to make it happen. With this said, resolutions are more likely to be adopted if significant concerns raised—and maybe addressed—prior to a resolution coming to the Senate floor.

On the matter of executive sessions, the Parliamentarian raised the issue of who should participate. She encouraged inviting voting members of relevant committees. For example, the CFO's recent presentation in executive session creates a potentially awkward or unfair situation for subsequent committee discussions of MFA finances, as non-Senate members weren't privy to the information, and Senate members couldn't share executive session content. Going forward, the Parliamentarian recommended that committee members be invited to relevant executive sessions; this can be added to the (amendable and debatable) motion to go into executive session. This requires that FSEC work with any relevant committee chairs to make sure committee members are invited to an executive session in advance. A formal change in the bylaws is not necessary to make this happen, and the Parliamentarian recommended that FSEC start with a change in practice and see how its implementation goes. In the future, the bylaws could be amended, perhaps to make committee invitation the default.

## **Academic Freedom Portal**

The Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee has provided a brief report on the responses received through the academic freedom portal. That report was circulated with the agenda for today's meeting and has been posted to the Senate website.

## **Senate & FSEC Membership**

All schools have now completed their Senate elections and have reported results to the Senate office. The FSEC Nominating Committee will meet soon to confirm the slate of nominees for the 2024-2025 FSEC. The slate will be put forward for election at the top of the May Senate meeting.

## **Faculty Organization Plan**

Following the Board's approval of recent amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan, the Senate office has posted an up-to-date version of the FOP to the Senate website. The [downloadable PDF](#) includes a table of contents, best accessed from the Bookmarks sidebar in Acrobat, to assist with navigating the document.

## **Personnel Actions**

There is one active grievance at the university, in the Elliott School of International Affairs; the parties have agreed to mediation.

## **Calendar**

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is April 26, 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 April 19. The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting, the first of the 2024-2025 session, is May 10, 2024.