



Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate will meet on
Friday, May 12, 2023, at 2:00pm via WebEx.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on April 14, 2023
3. Acknowledgment of [Senate members beginning terms](#)
4. Election of the Senate Parliamentarian/Professor Sarah Binder (Mark Wrighton, President)
5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Mark Wrighton, President)
6. Brief Statements and Questions/President's Report
7. [RESOLUTION 24/1](#): Of Appreciation of President Mark Wrighton (Ilana Feldman, Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee)
8. [RESOLUTION 24/2](#): To Approve Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity (Sarah Wagner, Co-Chair, Educational Policy & Technology Committee)
9. [RESOLUTION 24/3](#): Clarifying Shared Governance and the Role of the Faculty Senate on the Occasion of a New President of the University (Professor Guillermo Orti)
10. [REPORT](#): Joint Report on Classroom Recordings/Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies, Educational Policy & Technology, and Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committees (Sarah Wagner, Co-Chair, Educational Policy & Technology Committee)
11. INTRODUCTION OF NEW RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE
12. GENERAL BUSINESS
 - a) Standing Committee annual reports received
 - [Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom](#)
 - [Research](#)
 - b) Approval of the [2023-2024 Senate calendar](#)
 - c) Appointment of [2023-2024 Senate Standing Committee chairs & rosters](#)
 - d) Appointment of [2023-2024 University administrative committee faculty representatives](#)
 - e) Report of the Executive Committee (Professor Ilana Feldman, Chair)
 - f) Provost's Remarks
13. Brief Statements and Questions/General Business
14. Adjournment

Katie Cloud
Secretary



Faculty Senate

Incoming Senate Members May 2023

CCAS

Oleg Kargaltsev

Don Parsons

David Rain

ESIA

Jennifer Brinkerhoff

GWSB

Yixin Lu

GSEHD

Laura Engel

SEAS

Sameh Badie

SMHS

Paul Marvar

A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR PRESIDENT MARK WRIGHTON (24/1)

WHEREAS, Mark Wrighton has served with great distinction as the President of the George Washington University since January 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Wrighton, as President, has displayed extraordinary wisdom, perseverance, transparency, kindness, good humor, and leadership in steering GW through a difficult transition and has commanded the trust of the faculty, students, staff, and trustees because of his transparent and collaborative style; and

WHEREAS, President Wrighton has recruited and appointed an outstanding senior leadership team for both the academic and administrative sides of the George Washington University that will have significant impact on the quality and efficiency of university functions; and

WHEREAS, President Wrighton has collaborated closely with the Faculty Senate in formulating a wide range of University policies, all of which have had a very positive impact on the University; and

WHEREAS, President Wrighton has made seminal contributions in promoting the benefits of effective shared governance between the Faculty, the Administration, and the Board of Trustees which, while also engendering a spirit of good will and cooperation, will serve as an enduring model of exemplary University administration at GW; and

WHEREAS, President Wrighton has earned the highest level of respect, gratitude, and admiration among the Faculty and the entire University community;

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

That the Faculty Senate hereby acknowledges and expresses its deep appreciation and gratitude to Mark Wrighton for his devoted and highly effective service to the Faculty and the University.

That this Resolution of Appreciation be appropriately inscribed and conveyed to Mark Wrighton, with a copy to be included in the official minutes of the May 2023 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

**THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY HEREBY
EXPRESSES ITS DEEPEST ADMIRATION, APPRECIATION, AND GRATITUDE TO
PRESIDENT MARK WRIGHTON FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AND
LEADERSHIP**

Adopted by Acclamation
May 12, 2023

Ilana Feldman, Chair
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate



Faculty Senate

A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CHANGES TO THE CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (24/2)

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

WHEREAS, substantive procedures such as a Warning Process for low-level violations, clarifying rights afforded to responding students, and delineating a carveout that Pre-College students are not included within the scope of the Code should be added to promote knowledge of individual rights and support community members to identify and repair harm; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS RECOMMENDED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the proposed changes to the Code of Academic Integrity (summarized below and detailed in Appendix “Redline of Proposed Changes”) be implemented effective August 1, 2023.

- a. Adding procedural and case resolution guidance such as adding a Warning Process, espousing further guidelines for all parties involved in an Academic Integrity Panel, and clarifying record retention in order to accomplish the following:
 - i. Create a restorative way of supporting the GW Community to address and repair harm;
 - ii. Address concerns and feedback of reporting instructors that starting at a grade-related sanction and generating a reportable record are disproportionate for some matters;
 - iii. Provide clarifying information on what rights and responsibilities all parties have in the Academic Integrity Panel Process;
 - iv. Increase consistency with the Code of Student Conduct on the administrative archival of records.
- b. Clarifying that Pre-College Students are not subject to the Code.
- c. Amending the approval process so that final approval of changes rests with the Provost and President, rather than the Board of Trustees. This unburdens the Board, aligns effectively with shared governance, and extends the process of receiving community feedback.

Appendix A

Code of Academic Integrity

Preamble

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

Article I: The Authority of the Code of Academic Integrity

Section 1: Application of the Code of Academic Integrity

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

- 1) The Law School ~~and~~
- 2) The Medical Doctor Program in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences-
- 2)3) Students admitted to the University through any Pre-College Programs for the duration of their enrollment in that Pre-College Program

Section 2: Precedence of the Code of Academic Integrity

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

~~However, The remainder of this Code, however, including~~ the procedures and the accompanying guidance outlined in this Code, will be used to resolve all reports of academic integrity violations subject to ~~the~~ this Code made on or after the effective date of the Code, regardless of when the alleged incident occurred.

Section 3: Interpretation

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

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

Article II: Basic Considerations

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

Section 1: Definition of Academic Integrity Violations

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 2: Reporting violations

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

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

Section 3: Assignments and Examinations

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

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

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

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

Article III: The University Integrity and Conduct Council

Section 1: Mission of the University Integrity and Conduct Council

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

academic integrity and for administering all procedures in this Code.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 3: Selection and Removal of UICC Members

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

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

subject to the Code or a designee; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 4: Case Procedures

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

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

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

be initiated as follows:

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

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

- 4) In the event a student withdraws or drops the relevant course while a case is pending, the case may still proceed under this Code.
- 5) Cases may be resolved by one of the following:
 - a) ~~When the Instructor of Record determines that the initial facts of a case indicate the circumstances calls for a low-level educational sanction and a warning status sanction against similar future behavior is the maximum appropriate outcome, a warning may be issued following the initial review of the case. This warning does not constitute a student conduct or an academic conduct record and will typically not be included in a general release. The respondent may request a fact-finding process to refute the assignment of a warning status and any attending educational sanction. In that event, the Instructor of Record will have the option to move forward with the formal case procedures outlined below~~ Academic Integrity Panel (AIP) process.-
 - a)b) Academic Integrity Agreements, in which both the respondent and the instructor of record agree to the finding of violation for all allegations and sanctions, in accordance with Section 5 of this Code. The written agreement will be provided to SRR to advise regarding sanctioning consistency, with the final determination being the mutual agreement of the instructor of record and respondent, evidenced by the respondent's signature. , evidenced by each person's signature
 - b)c) Determination by the AIPs when the respondent does not accept responsibility for the alleged violations or does not accept the proposed sanction. In such cases, the AIP will review the case in accordance with the procedural guidelines outlined below.
- 6) All actions, on any level, shall be recorded with SRR. Instructors of record must notify and submit the appropriate documentation about any violation of this Code to SRR for proper retention of records.

- (d) The following procedures shall guide AIP Hearings. These procedures exist to establish standards of fundamental fairness, and minor deviations from procedural guidelines for proceedings suggested in this Code shall not invalidate a decision or proceeding unless significant prejudice to the participating parties, including the university, may result, as determined by the Provost & Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs or their designee.

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

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

not invalidate the proceedings.

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

11) Statements regarding the character of respondents, instructors, and witnesses will not be considered unless deemed directly relevant to specific facts of the case by the presiding officer or the Director or their designee.

12) Instead of ~~in-person oral-verbal~~ statements, written statements whose author is confirmed or other forms of participation may be accepted at the discretion of the Director of SRR or designee. In lieu of oral statements, authenticated written statements or other forms of participation may be accepted at the discretion of the Director or their designee.

13) The presiding officer ~~and/or~~ the Director or their designee may limit the presentation or number of witnesses to prevent repetition or delay or the presentation of irrelevant or immaterial information.

14) Any student participant may decline to answer questions or elect not to speak on their own behalf.

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

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

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

18) Further, the following rights shall be provided to a respondent through the Academic Integrity Panel Hearing Process:

- a) The right to question and respond to information that will be used to make a decision.
- b) The right to a decision based on the relevant evidence. However, formal rules of evidence shall not be applicable in proceedings conducted pursuant to this Code as in a court of law. The reliance upon evidence shall be determined by principles of fundamental fairness.
- c) The right not to be sanctioned unless the hearing body finds by a preponderance of the evidence, that the respondent is in violation.
- d) The right to be accompanied by a support person. The role of the support person shall be limited to consultation with the respondent they are supporting. Under no circumstances is the support person permitted to address the AIP, speak on behalf of the respondent, or question other participants. At the discretion of the presiding officer, violations of this limitation will result in the support person being removed from the hearing. The University retains the right to have legal counsel present at any hearing.
- ~~14)e) The right to appeal decisions to a higher authority or body within the administrative processes provided in this Code.~~ the appeal and review processes, as described in this Code.

Section 5: Sanctions

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

- 7) protection of the University community;
 - 8) necessary outcomes in order to eliminate the prohibited conduct, prevent its recurrence, and remedy its effects on members of the University community; and,
 - 9) any mitigating, aggravating, or compelling circumstances in order to reach a just and appropriate resolution in each case, including the respondent's demonstration of the understanding and impact of the violation.
- b) Possible sanctions include, but are not limited to, the following:
- 1) Warning - An initial directive against similar behavior in the future. For purposes of external reporting, cases resulting in a warning do not create a student conduct or academic conduct record that is subject to a typical release unless a subsequent violation occurs. No grade-related sanction should be issued in conjunction with a Warning.
 - 2) educational sanctions intended to improve the respondent's understanding and implementation of academic integrity. This may be assigned in combination with any other sanction. If the respondent fails to complete these sanctions, a registration hold may be placed on their student account.
 - 3) reduction in academic credit for the assignment or course.
 - 4) failure of assignment (generally recommended for first violation).
 - 5) failure of course, including a transcript notation, until graduation and successful petition for removal (generally recommended for second violations or egregious first violations).
 - 6) suspension from the University for a specified period of time, including a transcript notation until seven (7) years from the date of the incident and successful petition for
 - 7) removal. Suspension may include requirements the student will need to complete in order to return or upon return.
 - 8) expulsion (permanent removal from the University), including a permanent transcript notation.
- c) Neither suspensions nor expulsions may be imposed through an Academic Integrity Agreement.
- d) Transcript notations for failure of course or suspensions may be removed upon expiration of the dates set forth above and only after successful petition of the respondent to the Provost or designee.
- e) Records shall be maintained and released by Student Rights & Responsibilities in accordance with University policy and applicable law.
- f) Following graduation or ~~three (3) years~~ ~~three (3) years from the date of the incident~~ ~~removal of transcript notation~~, whichever is later, ~~case records that do not include expulsion, or suspension, or an active transcript notation~~ ~~the respondent's record~~ will be transferred to an administrative archive status and therefore become internal and administrative (i.e. non-conduct) records. Case records that include suspension or failure of course will be transferred to administrative archive status upon the successful petition of the transcript notation removal. Case records including expulsions are never transferred to administrative archive status. Such

~~f~~Files that are transferred to administrative archive status are not part of general third-party releases, even with authorization from the respondent. Such records may be released to third-parties upon specific request of the respondent or as required by law.

~~f~~For purposes of this Code, “graduation,” means the completion of degree requirements at any post-secondary institution, not solely the George Washington University.

g)

—

~~g~~ Respondents found in violation of this Code may also be removed from or determined to be ineligible for certain University programs or activities, in accordance with the policies, rules, or eligibility criteria of that program or activity.

h)

~~h~~No outcome shall prohibit any program, department, college, or school of the University from retaining records of violations and reporting violations as required by their ~~professiona~~professional

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

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

Section 6: Appeals

(a) ~~A Respondent found in violation of this Code as a result of an Academic Integrity Panel and sanctioned by the applicable dean or designee After a decision has been confirmed by the relevant dean or designee regarding an appropriate sanction, the respondent~~ may submit a written ~~petition of~~ appeal to Student Rights & Responsibilities within five (5) business days of ~~being notified of~~ the outcome. -

(b) Appeals of the decision of the AIP or of the sanction imposed by the relevant dean or designee may be based only on the following grounds:

- 1) There was a material deviation from the procedures of this Code that affected the outcome.
- 2) There is new and relevant information that was unavailable at the time of the proceeding, with reasonable diligence and effort that could materially affect the outcome.

(c) Appeals will be reviewed by the Provost & Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs or a designee. The Provost or a designee will then ~~make a decision~~ decide on the appeal, based on the ~~appeal-written petition appeal~~ and the reports of the AIP and the relevant dean or designee. The appeal decision of the Provost will typically be rendered and provided to the instructor of record and the respondent within ten (10) business days of the appeal materials being received by the Provost.

~~The Provost or a designee may determine one of the following in connection with an appeal:
Affirm the finding of the original Academic Integrity Panel and the applicable dean or designee
Alter the sanction if the appeal is found to have grounds on the basis of new information
Return the case to the original panel for a new Academic Integrity Panel
Request that a new panel hear the case~~

(e)

(d) The decision of the Provost or designee in connection with the appeal shall be final and conclusive and no further appeals will be permitted. The dean of the respondent's home school at the University shall also receive final notice of the case outcome.

~~Sanctions will not typically be implemented while an appeal is pending unless the [IDENTIFY OFFICIAL] determines otherwise. Sanctions may be implemented while an appeal is pending if the continued presence of the respondent in the University community poses a threat to any person, or to the stability and continuance of normal university functions. This decision will be made of the Provost or a designee.~~

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

Section 1: Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity

(a) Substantial changes to this Code shall be referred to or initiated by the Provost or designee. Changes may also be initiated by either the Faculty Senate or the Student Association. Substantial changes must be approved by a majority vote of both the Faculty Senate and the Student Association.

(b) The Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students shall coordinate with the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students through the Provost to conduct a review of the Code of Academic Integrity at least once every five years.

~~(e)~~ Substantial changes will then be forwarded to the President of the University for approval/confirmation ~~and submission to the Board of Trustees.~~

(c)

Appendix B

Code of Academic Integrity

Preamble

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

Article I: The Authority of the Code of Academic Integrity

Section 1: Application of the Code of Academic Integrity

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

- 1) The Law School
- 2) The Medical Doctor Program in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences
- 3) Students admitted to the University through any Pre-College Programs for the duration of their enrollment in that Pre-College Program

Section 2: Precedence of the Code of Academic Integrity

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

Section 3: Interpretation

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

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

Article II: Basic Considerations

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

Section 1: Definition of Academic Integrity Violations

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 2: Reporting violations

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

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

Section 3: Assignments and Examinations

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

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

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

Article III: The University Integrity and Conduct Council

Section 1: Mission of the University Integrity and Conduct Council

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

academic integrity and for administering all procedures in this Code.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 3: Selection and Removal of UICC Members

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

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

subject to the Code or a designee; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 4: Case Procedures

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

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

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

be initiated as follows:

- 1) A student may initiate an allegation of academic integrity violations against another student, by referring the case to the instructor of record and/or to SRR. If the case is brought directly to SRR for action, then the Director or their designee shall promptly notify the instructor of record. If the instructor of record will not or is unable to address the case or propose a sanction, the matter will be referred to the department chair or other comparable official.
 - 2) When an instructor of record reports an allegation or is made aware of a violation that the instructor of record determines to be substantive, the instructor of record shall contact SRR in order to discover whether the student has ever been found in violation of this Code.
 - 3) However reported, the instructor of record is encouraged to present the student with specific allegations and may propose a sanction. The instructor of record may consult with SRR on sanctioning considerations. Sanctions will be determined in accordance with the relevant sections of this Code.
 - 4) In the event a student withdraws or drops the relevant course while a case is pending, the case may still proceed under this Code.
 - 5) Cases may be resolved by one of the following:
 - a) When the Instructor of Record determines that the circumstances calls for a low-level educational sanction and a warning status sanction against similar future behavior is the maximum appropriate outcome, a warning may be issued. This warning does not constitute a student conduct or an academic conduct record and will typically not be included in a general release. The respondent may request a fact-finding process to refute the assignment of a warning status and any attending educational sanction. In that event, the Instructor of Record will have the option to move forward with the Academic Integrity Panel (AIP) process.
 - b) Academic Integrity Agreements, in which both the respondent and the instructor of record agree to the finding of violation for all allegations and sanctions, in accordance with Section 5 of this Code. The written agreement will be provided to SRR to advise regarding sanctioning consistency, with the final determination being the mutual agreement of the instructor of record and respondent, evidenced by the respondent's signature.
 - c) Determination by the AIPs when the respondent does not accept responsibility for the alleged violations or does not accept the proposed sanction. In such cases, the AIP will review the case in accordance with the procedural guidelines outlined below.
 - 6) All actions, on any level, shall be recorded with SRR. Instructors of record must notify and submit the appropriate documentation about any violation of this Code to SRR for proper retention of records.
- (d) The following procedures shall guide AIP Hearings. These procedures exist to establish standards of fundamental fairness, and minor deviations from procedural guidelines for proceedings suggested in this Code shall not invalidate a decision or proceeding unless significant prejudice to the participating parties, including the university, may result, as determined by the Provost & Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs or their designee.
- 1) Respondents and instructors of record shall be given notice of the hearing date and the specific allegations at least five business days in advance and shall be accorded reasonable access to

the case file, which will be retained in SRR. The timeline for collection and distribution of documents from instructors of record and respondents will be in accordance with published procedures developed by the Director of SRR or their designee.

- 2) Any party may challenge an AIP member when a conflict of interest may exist.. In such cases, AIP members may be disqualified from the hearing at the determination of the Director.
- 3) Hearings will be closed to the public, without exception. Prospective witnesses, other than the instructor of record and respondent, shall be excluded from the hearing except while providing their statements. All parties and witnesses shall be excluded from AIP deliberations.
- 4) Hearings will occur in the absence of respondents who fail to appear after proper notice. If the respondent fails to appear, the instructor of record will still be required to present a case.
- 5) The presiding officer shall exercise control over the proceedings to achieve orderly and timely completion of the hearing. Any person, including the instructor of record and respondent, who disrupts a hearing may be excluded by the presiding officer. The presiding officer shall direct the hearing through the following stages: statements from both the instructor of record and respondent, questioning of witnesses by both the instructor of record and respondent, the questioning of the instructor of record, respondent, and any witnesses by panel members, and concluding statements by the instructor of record and respondent.
- 6) Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the investigatory model of administrative hearings, in which the AIP assumes responsibility for eliciting relevant evidence. The purpose of the hearing is to establish the facts. The standard of proof for making a finding of in violation will be the preponderance of evidence standard (i.e., based on the evidence presented, it is more likely than not that a violation occurred). Where the AIP vote outcome is tied, the preponderance of evidence standard has not been met and the AIP's decision is that the respondent will be found not in violation.
- 7) Formal rules of evidence shall not be applicable in proceedings conducted pursuant to this Code. The presiding officer and the Director or their designee shall have the discretion to admit all matters into evidence that reasonable persons would accept as relevant.
- 8) Hearings will be recorded and the recording will be retained as part of the record.
- 9) SRR or the presiding officer may request the attendance of witnesses upon request by any AIP member or of either party. Only witnesses who can provide direct knowledge about the given case shall be called. Requests must be approved by the Director or their designee. University students and employees are expected to comply with such requests. Instructors of record and respondents shall be accorded an opportunity to question those witnesses who participate for either party at the hearing. Failure of witnesses to appear will not invalidate the proceedings.

- 10) Witnesses shall be asked to affirm that their statement is truthful. Any student, faculty, or staff member who knowingly provides false information during this process will be referred to Student Rights & Responsibilities, Human Resources, and/or the Office of the Provost as appropriate for review and appropriate disposition.
- 11) Statements regarding the character of respondents, instructors, and witnesses will not be considered unless deemed directly relevant to specific facts of the case by the presiding officer or the Director or their designee.
- 12) Instead of verbal statements, written statements whose author is confirmed or other forms of participation may be accepted at the discretion of the Director of SRR or designee.
- 13) The presiding officer and the Director or their designee may limit the presentation or number of witnesses to prevent repetition or delay or the presentation of irrelevant or immaterial information.
- 14) Any student participant may decline to answer questions or elect not to speak on their own behalf.
- 15) AIP's deliberation following the hearing shall occur in two stages: the determination regarding responsibility and if applicable, recommendation of sanctions. To find a respondent in violation of the Code, a majority of the voting AIP members must agree. If the AIP finds a respondent in violation, they shall also make a sanctioning recommendation. A sanction other than expulsion can be recommended by the affirmative vote of three-quarters of the voting AIP members. In the event of a tie regarding sanctions other than expulsion, the presiding officer casts the deciding vote. A sanction of expulsion can be recommended only by an affirmative vote of all voting AIP members.
- 16) Following the hearing, a report will be written on the hearing. Reports of the AIP shall include a determination of the responsibility of the respondent. If the respondent is found in violation, then the report will also include a recommendation of sanctions. Sanctions will be recommended and determined in accordance with the relevant sections of this Code. If an AIP determines that a respondent is in violation of the Code, the report shall be forwarded to the dean of the school in which the academic integrity violation occurred or a designee without a conflict of interest in the case, as determined by the dean. If in the judgment of the dean or designee the sanction recommended by the AIP is a significant deviation from the sanctions imposed in closely similar cases, the dean or designee may revise the sanction before notifying the respondent of the determination and sanction. The dean or designee may not modify or revise the AIP's determination of responsibility. The instructor of record and department chair of the course shall receive a copy of the determination and sanction.
- 17) These proceedings should be concluded as expeditiously as possible. The AIPs should strive to have proceedings concluded within four weeks of the report of the violation. However, failure to do so shall not constitute improper procedure under the Code.
- 18) Further, the following rights shall be provided to a respondent through the Academic Integrity Panel Hearing Process:
 - a) The right to question and respond to information that will be used to make a decision.
 - b) The right to a decision based on relevant evidence. However, formal rules of evidence shall not be applicable in proceedings conducted pursuant to this

Code as in a court of law. The reliance upon evidence shall be determined by principles of fundamental fairness.

- c) The right not to be sanctioned unless the hearing body finds by a preponderance of the evidence, that the respondent is in violation.
- d) The right to be accompanied by a support person. The role of the support person shall be limited to consultation with the respondent they are supporting. Under no circumstances is the support person permitted to address the AIP, speak on behalf of the respondent, or question other participants. At the discretion of the presiding officer, violations of this limitation will result in the support person being removed from the hearing. The University retains the right to have legal counsel present at any hearing.
- e) The right to the appeal and review processes, as described in this Code.

Section 5: Sanctions

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

- 7) protection of the University community;
 - 8) necessary outcomes in order to eliminate the prohibited conduct, prevent its recurrence, and remedy its effects on members of the University community; and,
 - 9) any mitigating, aggravating, or compelling circumstances in order to reach a just and appropriate resolution in each case, including the respondent's demonstration of the understanding and impact of the violation.
- b) Possible sanctions include, but are not limited to, the following:
- 1) Warning - An initial directive against similar behavior in the future. For purposes of external reporting, cases resulting in a warning do not create a student conduct or academic conduct record that is subject to a typical release unless a subsequent violation occurs. No grade-related sanction should be issued in conjunction with a Warning.
 - 2) educational sanctions intended to improve the respondent's understanding and implementation of academic integrity. This may be assigned in combination with any other sanction. If the respondent fails to complete these sanctions, a registration hold may be placed on their student account.
 - 3) reduction in academic credit for the assignment or course.
 - 4) failure of assignment (generally recommended for first violation).
 - 5) failure of course, including a transcript notation, until graduation and successful petition for removal (generally recommended for second violations or egregious first violations).
 - 6) suspension from the University for a specified period of time, including a transcript notation until seven (7) years from the date of the incident and successful petition for removal. Suspension may include requirements the student will need to complete in order to return or upon return.
 - 7) expulsion (permanent removal from the University), including a permanent transcript notation.
- c) Neither suspensions nor expulsions may be imposed through an Academic Integrity Agreement.
- d) Transcript notations for failure of course or suspensions may be removed upon expiration of the dates set forth above and only after successful petition of the respondent to the Provost or designee.
- e) Records shall be maintained and released by Student Rights & Responsibilities in accordance with University policy and applicable law.
- f) Following graduation or three (3) years from the date of the incident, whichever is later, case records that do not include expulsion, suspension, or an active transcript notation will be transferred to an administrative archive status and therefore become internal and administrative (i.e. non-conduct) records. Case records that include suspension or failure of course will be transferred to administrative archive status upon the successful petition of the transcript notation removal. Case records including expulsions are never transferred to administrative archive status. Files that are transferred to administrative archive status are not part of general

third-party releases, even with authorization from the respondent. Such records may be released to third parties upon specific request of the respondent or as required by law.

- g) For purposes of this Code, “graduation,” means the completion of degree requirements at any post-secondary institution, not solely the George Washington University.
- h) Respondents found in violation of this Code may also be removed from or determined to be ineligible for certain University programs or activities, in accordance with the policies, rules, or eligibility criteria of that program or activity.
- i) No outcome shall prohibit any program, department, college, or school of the University from retaining records of violations and reporting violations as required by their professional standards. The University may retain, for appropriate administrative purposes, records of all proceedings regarding violations of this Code.
- j) Sanctions assigned to a respondent found in violation of this Code may also have subsequent ramifications upon their academic standing in an academic course or academic program in accordance with the faculty member’s syllabus or in the academic college, school, or department regulations and bylaws.

Section 6: Appeals

- (a) A Respondent found in violation of this Code as a result of an Academic Integrity Panel and sanctioned by the applicable dean or designee may submit a written appeal to Student Rights & Responsibilities within five (5) business days of being notified of the outcome.
- (b) Appeals of the decision of the AIP or of the sanction imposed by the relevant dean or designee may be based only on the following grounds:
 - 1) There was a material deviation from the procedures of this Code that affected the outcome.
 - 2) There is new and relevant information that was unavailable at the time of the proceeding, with reasonable diligence and effort that could materially affect the outcome.
- (c) Appeals will be reviewed by the Provost & Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs or a designee. The Provost or a designee will then decide on the appeal, based on the written appeal and the reports of the AIP and the relevant dean or designee. The appeal decision of the Provost will typically be rendered and provided to the instructor of record and the respondent within ten (10) business days of the appeal materials being received by the Provost.
- (d) The decision of the Provost or designee in connection with the appeal shall be final and conclusive and no further appeals will be permitted. The dean of the respondent’s home school at the University shall also receive final notice of the case outcome.

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

Section 1: Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity

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



RESOLUTION CLARIFYING SHARED GOVERNANCE AND THE ROLE OF THE FACULTY SENATE ON THE OCCASION OF A NEW PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY (24/3)

- WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate is the agency to which the President initially presents information and which they consult concerning proposed changes in existing policies or promulgation of new policies¹;
- WHEREAS**, the functions of the Faculty Senate are to formulate principles and objectives and find facts, so as to recommend policies to the President and also provide the President and the Board of Trustees with advice and counsel on such matters as they may request¹;
- WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) shall serve as a channel through which any member of the Assembly may introduce matters for the consideration of the Senate²;
- WHEREAS**, FSEC shall receive reports prepared by or in any college, school, or division of the University that may be of concern or interest to any or all other colleges, schools, or divisions, or to the faculty generally, and arrange for distribution of copies thereof to such other college, school, or division or the faculty²;
- WHEREAS**, FSEC shall serve as the committee on committees for the Faculty Senate and in that capacity nominate the members and chairmen of the standing and special committees, each with specific areas of expertise enumerated in the bylaws of the Faculty Senate and established by the senate for that purpose²;
- WHEREAS**, FSEC members do not have universal knowledge across all topics that may concern the university, but they do have knowledge of which faculty bodies have expertise in which particular area, therefore their function is to convey information to other such faculty bodies and determine the appropriate faculty body for consultation;
- WHEREAS**, the Senate (SR 22/13) recommends that future discussions of shared governance appreciate the vital importance of Senate committees, where faculty and staff collaboratively bring their expertise to bear in policymaking and problem solving, and that providing these committees with meaningful opportunities to participate in policymaking and strategic planning in their respective areas, as mandated by the FOP, is essential for the success of our mission as a university;
- WHEREAS**, direct interpretation of the Faculty Organization Plan (FOP III.5.b) indicates that FSEC exceeds its authority if it keeps information secret from other faculty bodies, especially Senate Committees, other than information related to personnel decisions such as non-concurrence cases, grievance procedures, and procedures for dismissal of faculty for a cause described in the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code; and
- WHEREAS**, FSEC has exceeded its authority by holding confidential deliberations with the Administration in the past, for example in the case of a new policy on arming GW Police Officers³;

¹ Faculty Organization Plan (FOP), Article III, Section 1.

² FOP, Article III, Section 5(b)

³Minutes of the Regular Senate Meeting held on April 14, 2023: <https://bpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/blogs.gwu.edu/dist/0/196/files/2023/04/April-2023-minutes-attachments.pdf>

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

- (1) That the FSEC is not empowered to receive any non-emergency communications, information, or notifications with a request to act on behalf of the faculty or the Faculty Senate on a confidential basis, except for personnel issues described in the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code;
- (2) That in light of the principles and procedures outlined in the FOP (III.5.b.5 and III.5.b.6), future requests by the Administration that FSEC or any of its members hold some matter secret rather than forwarding it to the proper faculty body (including those nominated by FSEC) shall be understood as inconsistent with the FOP;
- (3) That communication of any matter (other than personnel issues) with FSEC or any of its members (including the chair) and no other faculty shall not constitute effective consultation with the Faculty Senate, even if FSEC has taken action by commenting on, or responding to, or advising in either written or oral form on the matter;
- (4) That any recommendation made by FSEC to the Administration or Board of Trustees shall be understood as an action of FSEC controlled by the provisions of the FOP (III.5.b.6) whereby FSEC actions may be taken only in emergencies and they must be reported to the Faculty Senate for confirmation by vote at the next meeting;
- (5) That the Faculty Senate reminds the university that transparency is a central principle of shared governance. Confidentiality deprives students, staff and faculty of the ability to form their own judgments about university policies and procedures, and other considerations of weight, and makes community members feel as if the University Leadership and the Board of Trustees does not respect their views or judgments; and
- (6) That the Faculty Senate urges the FSEC to enhance transparency by publicly posting its minutes and agendas to the fullest extent feasible, consistent with the need to protect confidential personnel matters.

Respectfully submitted to the FSEC and endorsed by:

Guillermo Ortí, Biological Sciences, CCAS (24 April, 2023)

Eric Grynaviski, Political Sciences, CCAS (24 April, 2023)*

Sarah Wagner, Anthropology, CCAS (24 April, 2023)

Murli Gupta, Mathematics, CCAS (24 April, 2023)

Katrin Schultheiss, History, CCAS (24 April, 2023)

Heather Bamford, Romance, German & Slavic Languages/Literatures, CCAS (24 April, 2023)

Alexa Alice Joubin, English, CCAS (24 April, 2023)*

Barbara Von Barghahn, Art History, CCAS (24 April, 2023)

Donald Clarke, GW Law School (25 April, 2023)

David Rain, Geography, CCAS (25 April, 2023)

Harris Mylonas, Political Science and International Affairs, ESIA (25 April, 2023)

*Senate members whose terms ended on May 1, 2023. All others are in the Senate Roster for 2023-2024; date they signed the resolution in parenthesis.



Faculty Senate

Classroom Recordings Policy Report: Executive Summary and Recommendations

(Joint Work of the Senate Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies, Educational Policy & Technology, and Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committees)

In November 2022, the Faculty Senate administered a survey of all faculty (excluding the Law School*) to assess current recording practices and gauge concerns about current policy. The relatively high response rate to the survey suggests that many faculty care about the issue of classroom recordings. Key findings from the survey are:

1. Faculty are far more likely to record lecture classes than seminar or lab classes.
2. Of those who record, most record all classes and release them to all students in the class.
3. Most respondents have not attempted any of the other recording options (adaptive release, selective recording, erasing) suggesting that more communication and instruction on these processes would be helpful.
4. A majority of faculty see value in creating recordings, especially for students with disabilities or with short-term illnesses.
5. They remain concerned about a number of factors, especially the unauthorized circulation, editing, or viewing of recordings and the negative effect of recordings on class attendance.

Representatives from the Senate's PEAFF, ASPP, and EPT Committees met with Vice-Provost Emily Hammond on January 18, 2023, to clarify current university policies on classroom recordings. VP Hammond stated, among other things, that: 1) faculty retain ownership of the intellectual property contained in the recordings; 2) recordings may be reviewed without faculty consent to comply with legal proceedings; 3) the university retains legal ownership of the files that are recorded using university equipment or software; and 4) because the university retains ownership of the files, administrators have the right to review recordings without informing the faculty member.** VP Hammond offered assurance that administrators would only review recordings for "valid reasons" though that concept remained undefined. Currently, there is no formal mechanism for informing or seeking consent from regular faculty members whose recordings are under review.

In an e-mail on February 7, 2023, responding to a query from the EPT subcommittee on this matter, Yordanos Baharu, Executive Director of Academic Enterprise Applications, explained that faculty have the technical capability to erase recordings on most platforms. This capability would seem to complicate the question of ownership of files.

Recommendations: (Note: The recommendations pertain to full-time faculty only as policies for part-time faculty are covered under a collective bargaining agreement.)

1. The administration/academic technology team should work to improve faculty awareness of recording options and simplify processes for selective/adaptive release, stop/start recording, editing recordings, and erasing recordings.
2. The administration should issue a statement as well as add a pop-up box to the recording set-up protocols clarifying that:
 - a. faculty retain intellectual property rights over the content of their recorded classes.
 - b. administrators will not access classroom recordings without the instructor's consent except when there is an external controlling statutory authority.
 - c. faculty retain the right to deny GW administrators access to recordings without reprisal.
 - d. faculty retain the right to edit or erase classroom recordings.
3. The administration should inform all faculty of these policies in a dedicated e-mail sent before the start of the Fall 2023 semester.

*The Law School's recording practices and policies are administratively controlled.

** For part-time faculty, access to classroom recordings is governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Classroom Recordings Report

Issued to Senate Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies, Educational Policy & Technology, and Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committees

Feb. 9, 2023

Contents:

- p. 1. Narrative summary of faculty survey. Survey administered Nov. 2022
- p. 4. Legal Issues: Summary of Jan. 18, 2023 meeting with Vice Provost Emily Hammond on legal ownership of classroom recordings.
- p. 6. Information on faculty recording deletion capability and university retention of recordings from Yordanos Baharu, Exec. Dir. of Academic Enterprise Applications.

Summary of Survey

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

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

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

Faculty Recording Policies

Among those who taught **undergraduate lecture classes**, over 70% engaged in some form of classroom recording. The largest group (46%) recorded all their classes and made those recordings available to all students in the class. About 10% recorded all classes but only released selectively while another 10% recorded some of their classes and a few recorded portions of classes. 28% did not record at all.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Faculty Experiences with Recording:

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

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

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

Reasons for Recording:

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

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

Reasons for Not Recording Classes:

The survey listed six reasons for not recording classes and asked faculty to report whether they regarded those factors as "Extremely Important," "Very Important," "Moderately Important," "Somewhat Important," "Minimally Important", or "Not Important." The six reasons were "Student

Privacy," "Instructor Privacy," "Unauthorized Use for P&T or Disciplinary Action," "Unauthorized Circulation or Editing," "Loss of Intellectual Property Rights," "Class Attendance Concerns."

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

CONCLUSIONS FROM SURVEY DATA:

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

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

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

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

1. Copyright of Intellectual Property

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

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

2. Access to recordings

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

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

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

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

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

4. On the question of whether faculty can voluntarily provide recordings as a mechanism for enabling review of their teaching, VP Hammond said that they believed that in-person classes should be reviewed in person in order for the faculty member to provide the very best opportunity

for a fulsome review. On-line classes could be reviewed via recordings. This appeared to be a recommendation rather than a legal stipulation.

Notes:

* "Substantial Use" of university resources is that use of university laboratory, studio, audio, audiovisual, video, television, broadcast, computer, computational or other facilities, resources and Staff or Students which:

- Falls outside the scope of the Faculty member's or Librarian's normal job responsibilities or the Student's academic program or
- Entails a Faculty member's or Librarian's use of such resources that are not ordinarily available to all or virtually all Faculty members with comparable status in the same school or department or to all or virtually all similarly situated Librarians.
- The term Substantial Use does not include the use of university provided office space, local telephone, library resources and computer equipment incidental to outside activities that are permitted under the Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Investigators.

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

[Information on faculty recording deletion capability and university retention of recordings from Yordanos Baharu, Executive Director of Academic Enterprise Applications](#) (Per e-mail from Yordanos, Feb. 7, 2023)

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

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

Question 2: How long does the university keep recordings?

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



Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE CALENDAR¹ 2023-2024 Academic Year

FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS²

2:00-4:30pm ~ 1957 E Street/State Room (7th floor) and/or via WebEx

May 12, 2023
September 8, 2023
October 20, 2023
November 10, 2023
December 8, 2023
January 12, 2024
February 9, 2024
March 1, 2024
April 12, 2024
May 10, 2024³

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS⁴

12noon-2:00pm ~ Executive Committee Members Only

August 25, 2023
September 29, 2023
October 27, 2023
November 17, 2023
December 15, 2023
January 26, 2024
February 23, 2024
March 22, 2024
April 26, 2024⁵

FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 2, 2023
4:00-5:30pm

¹ To permit compliance with the rules requiring seven days' notice of Senate meetings, the Executive Committee typically prepares the agenda two weeks in advance of regular Senate meetings.

² The Senate may hold Special Meetings as convened under the *Faculty Organization Plan*, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee may change the date of a Regular Meeting in unusual circumstances or may cancel a Regular Meeting for which there is not sufficient business.

³ First meeting of the 2024-2025 Academic Year session

⁴ The Executive Committee may hold Special Meetings as convened by the Chair.

⁵ Joint meeting of the outgoing and incoming Executive Committees

**Faculty Senate
Master Standing Committee List
2023-2024 Rosters**

Non-voting members are those committee members serving on a committee because of their administrative role at the university, and the value that the person in that role brings to the committee. Non-voting members may be nominated for service by the President, the Provost, or a committee chair. These administrative committee members are not approved by the full senate and are referenced here for informational purposes. Should a non-voting member change positions at or leave the university, that individual would no longer serve on the committee, but a new individual in that role could be named to the committee in the same capacity.

Appointment, Salary, & Promotion Policies

Member	Affiliation	Voting Status
<i>Gupta, Murli*</i> , Chair	CCAS	Voting
<i>LeLacheur, Susan</i> , Co-Chair	SMHS	Voting
<i>Briggs, Linda*</i> , FSEC Liaison	SON	Voting
Bamford, Heather*	CCAS	Voting
Borum, Marie*	SMHS	Voting
Bracey, Christopher	Faculty Affairs	Nonvoting
Brinkerhoff, Jennifer*	ESIA	Voting
Cordes, Joseph*	CCAS	Voting
El-Ghazawhi, Tarek*	SEAS	Voting
Ellis, Wendy	GWSPH	Voting
Ganjoo, Rohini	SMHS/SEAS	Voting
Ghaedi, Mohammad	CCAS/ESIA	Voting
Gore, Angela*	GWSB	Voting
Harizanov, Valentina	CCAS	Voting
Hayes, Carol	CCAS	Voting
Houghtby-Haddon, Natalie	CPS	Voting
Khilji, Shaista	GSEHD	Voting
Kieff, F. Scott*	LAW	Voting
Minor, Sabrina	VP HRMD, CPO	Nonvoting
Nasser, Samar	SMHS	Voting
Pericak, Arlene	SON	Voting
Rau, Pradeep	GWSB	Voting
Singh, Anita	LAW	Voting
Tekleselassie, Abe	GSEHD	Voting
Vyas, Amita*	GWSPH	Voting
Walters-Edwards, Doreen	SEAS	Voting
Wirtz, Phil*	GWSB	Voting
Young, Heather	GWSPH	Voting
Zaghloul, Mona	SEAS	Voting

Athletics & Recreation

Member	Affiliation	Voting Status
<i>Kay, Matthew*</i> , Chair	SEAS	Voting
<i>Wei, Peng</i> , Co-chair	SEAS	Voting
<i>Griesshammer, Harald*</i> , FSEC Liaison	CCAS	Voting
Anwar, Syed	SMHS	Voting
Baker, Robert	CCAS	Voting
Braungart, Carol	SON	Voting
Cassar, Linda	SON	Voting
Choma, Elizabeth	SON	Voting
Cole, Keith	SMHS	Voting
Coleman, Colette	Provost, Dean of Students	Nonvoting
Darcy-Mahoney, Ashley	SON	Voting
Echevarria, Mercedes	SON	Voting
Jayaseelan, Dhinu	SMHS	Voting
Johnson, Kurt	SMHS	Voting
Jorgensen, Cory	CCAS	Voting
Julien, Andre	Athletics	Nonvoting
Levers, Kyle	GWSPH	Voting
Marsh, Toni	CPS	Voting
McDonnell, Karen	GWSPH	Voting
Padovano, Cara	SON	Voting
Quinlan, Scott	GWSPH	Voting
Singh, Anita	LAW	Voting
Tatelbaum, Mark	GWSPH	Voting
Tuckwiller, Beth	GSEHD	Voting
Vogel, Tanya	Athletics	Nonvoting
Westerman, Beverly	NCAA Liaison	Nonvoting
Young, Heather	GWSPH	Voting

Educational Policy & Technology

Member	Affiliation	Voting Status
<i>Wagner, Sarah*</i> , Chair	CCAS	Voting
<i>Foster, Irene</i> , Co-Chair	CCAS	Voting
<i>Vyas, Amita*</i> , FSEC Liaison	GWSPH	Voting
Anderson, Suse	CCAS	Voting
Aviv, Eyal	CCAS	Voting
Badie, Sameh*	SEAS	Voting
Baharu, Yordanos	LAI	Nonvoting
Beil, Cheryl	Assessment	Nonvoting
Beveridge, Scott	GSEHD	Voting
Bhati, Sue	SON	Voting
Bochniak, Matt	LAW Staff	Voting
Brand, Jeff	Provost	Nonvoting
Bronner, Ben	GWSB	Voting

Choate, Thomas	GWSSB	Voting
Clarkson, Chante	Office of Student Success	Nonvoting
Cloud, Katie	Interim Registrar	Nonvoting
Cohen-Cole, Jamie	CCAS	Voting
Culbreath, Andre	CCAS Staff	Voting
Ensor, Brian	IT	Nonvoting
DeVoss Mahany, Crystal	CPS	Voting
Feuer, Michael	GSEHD	Nonvoting
Frierson, Tobe	Enrollment	Nonvoting
Ganjoo, Rohini	SMHS	Voting
Goff, Jay	Enrollment	Nonvoting
Greiff, Tobias	ESIA	Nonvoting
Griesshammer, Harald*	CCAS	Voting
Grynaviski, Eric	CCAS	Voting
Henry, Geneva	Provost	Nonvoting
House, Cody	CPS Staff	Voting
Jaqua, Dan	CCAS	Voting
Jeune, Jamie	ESIA Staff	Voting
Johnson, Candice	SMHS	Nonvoting
Johnson, Jared	IT	Nonvoting
Kadrie, Mountasser	SMHS	Voting
Kern, Michael	IT	Nonvoting
Khilji, Shaista	GSEHD	Voting
Knestrick, Joyce	SON	Voting
Knudsen, Kevin	LAI	Nonvoting
Lotrecchiano, Guy	SMHS	Voting
McDonough, Brooke	LAW	Voting
Murphy, Terry	Provost	Nonvoting
Quinlan, Scott	GWSPH	Voting
Rain, David*	CCAS/ESIA	Voting
Schultheiss, Katrin*	CCAS	Voting
Schwartz, Lisa	SMHS	Voting
Siczek, Megan	CCAS	Voting
Smith, Andrew	CCAS	Voting
Stoddard, Morgan	LAI	Nonvoting
Subramaniam, Suresh	Provost	Nonvoting
Thorpe, Jane Hyatt	GWSPH	Voting
Toll, Ben	Admissions	Nonvoting
Torres, Jason	Digital Learning Initiatives	Nonvoting
Trammel, Shauntae	IT	Nonvoting
Ulfers, Margaret	GWSPH	Voting
Williams, Kimberley	Student Success	Nonvoting
Wirtz, Phil*	GWSSB	Voting
Zara, Jason	SEAS	Nonvoting

Fiscal Planning & Budgeting

Member	Affiliation	Voting Status
<i>Cordes, Joe*</i> , Co-Chair	CCAS	Voting
<i>Kulp, Susan*</i> , Co-Chair	GWSB	Voting
<i>Zeman, Robert*</i> , FSEC Liaison	SMHS	Voting
Ali, Neena	University Controller	Nonvoting
Borum, Marie*	SMHS	Voting
Clarke, Donald*	LAW	Voting
Cohen-Cole, Jamie	CCAS	Voting
Fernandes, Bruno	Treasurer	Nonvoting
Freund, Maxine	GSEHD	Nonvoting
Glatzer, Michael	Vice Provost Budget & Finance	Nonvoting
Gore, Angela*	GWSB	Voting
Grayfer, Leon	CCAS	Voting
Gupta, Murli*	CCAS	Voting
Haerian, Krystl	SMHS	Voting
Henry, Geneva	LAI	Nonvoting
Jaqua, Dan	CCAS	Voting
Kadrie, Mountasser	SMHS	Voting
Keeney, Jonathon	SMHS	Voting
Kim, Mikyong	GSEHD	Voting
Morely, Brendan	CCAS	Voting
Murphy, Teresa	Provost	Nonvoting
Parsons, Don*	CCAS	Voting
Spear, Joanna	ESIA	Voting
Tielsch, James*	GWSPH	Voting
Williams, Ben	CCAS	Voting
Wilson, Arthur*	GWSB	Voting

Honors & Academic Convocations

Member	Affiliation	Voting Status
<i>Schultheiss, Katrin*</i> , Chair	CCAS	Voting
<i>Griesshammer, Harald*</i> , FSEC Liaison	CCAS	Voting
Abbruzzese, Jennifer	Provost's Office	Nonvoting
Benitez-Curry, Barbara	CCAS	Voting
Bracey, Christopher	Faculty Affairs	Nonvoting
Cox, Catherine	SON	Voting
Friedman, Leonard	GWSPH	Voting
Hegarty, Paul	Events	Nonvoting
Ingraham, Loring	CCAS	Voting
Lotrecchiano, Gaetano	SMHS	Voting
Moskowitz, Andrew	CCAS	Voting
Ritsema, Tamara	SMHS	Voting
Rosseau, Gail	SMHS	Voting
Schwindt, Rhonda*	SON	Voting

Libraries

Member	Affiliation	Voting Status
<i>Schwindt, Rhonda*</i> , Chair	SON	Voting
<i>Dugan, Holly</i> , Co-Chair	CCAS	Voting
<i>Feldman, Ilana*</i> , FSEC Liaison	ESIA	Voting
Abate, Laura	SMHS	Nonvoting
Chung, Sughun	GWSPH	Voting
Ghaedi, Mohammad	CCAS/ESIA	Voting
Henry, Geneva	LAI	Nonvoting
Jones, Sylvia	Staff	Voting
Karroum, Elias	SMHS	Voting
McAlear-Keeler, Kerry	CCAS	Voting
Pagel, Scott	Law Library	Nonvoting
Patel, Ashesh	SMHS	Voting
Peng, Yisheng	CCAS	Voting
Rodriguez, Ken	Law Library	Nonvoting
Scalzitti, David	SMHS	Voting
Telikicherla, Puja	CPS	Voting
Temprosa, Marinella	GWSPH	Voting
Thoma, Kathleen	SMHS	Voting
Trimmer, Leslie	GSEHD	Voting
Venzke, Margaret	SON	Voting
Warren, John	CPS	Voting
Whitt, Karen	SON	Voting

Physical Facilities

Member	Affiliation	Voting Status
<i>Tielsch, James*</i> , Chair	GWSPH	Voting
<i>Traub, John</i> , Co-Chair	CCAS	Voting
<i>Eakle, Jonathan*</i> , FSEC Liaison	GSEHD	Voting
Choate, Thomas	GWSPH	Voting
Cloud, Katie	Interim Registrar	Nonvoting
Coleman, Colette	Dean of Students	Nonvoting
Crawford, Douglas	CCAS	Voting
DeRaedt, Mary	GSEHD	Voting
Echevarria, Mercedes	SON	Voting
Fontana Keszler, Vanessa	CPS	Voting
Goodly, Baxter	Facilities	Nonvoting
Gutman, Jeffrey*	LAW	Voting
Hurst, Sarah-Kay	CCAS	Voting
Levers, Kyle	GWSPH	Voting
Mahshie, James	CCAS	Voting

Murphy, Terry	Provost	Nonvoting
Pagel, Scott	LAW	Voting
Pericak, Arlene	SON	Voting
Pittman, Delishia*	GSEHD	Voting
Rohrbeck, Cynthia	CCAS	Voting
Tate, James	GWPD	Nonvoting
Thessin, Rebecca	GSEHD	Voting
Zeman, Robert*	SMHS	Voting

Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom

Member	Affiliation	Voting Status
<i>Orti, Guillermo*, Chair</i>	CCAS	Voting
<i>Houghtby-Haddon, Natalie, Co-Chair</i>	CPS	Voting
<i>Kieff, Scott*, FSEC Liaison</i>	LAW	Voting
Abrams, Lowell	CCAS	Voting
Anderson, Suse	CCAS	Voting
Attia, Mina	GSEHD	Voting
Bhati, Sue	SON	Voting
Bracey, Christopher	Faculty Affairs	Nonvoting
Burke, Guenevere	SMHS/GWSPH	Voting
Clayton, Jennifer	GSEHD	Voting
Cohen-Cole, Jamie	CCAS	Voting
Cseh, Maria	GSEHD	Voting
Culbreath, Andre	CCAS Staff	Voting
Darr, Kurt	SPH, Emeritus	Voting
El-Ghazawi, Tarek*	SEAS	Voting
Gastwirth, Joseph	CCAS	Voting
Glenn, Adriana	SON	Voting
Griesshammer, Harald*	CCAS	Voting
Gutman, Jeffrey*	LAW	Voting
Jain, Vivek	SMHS	Voting
Jacobsen, Frederick	SMHS	Voting
Koch, Ulrich	SMHS	Voting
Kyriakopoulos, Nick	SEAS Emeritus	Voting
Liebow, Lisa	CPS	Voting
Marotta-Walters, Sylvia	GSEHD	Voting
Morley, Brendan	CCAS	Voting
Munar, Wolfgang	SPH	Voting
Patel, Ashesh	SMHS	Voting
Perez-Gaitan, Anapaula	LAW Staff	Voting
Pollard, Christopher	LAW/GSEHD Staff	Voting
Schwartz, Arnold	GWSPH Emeritus	Voting
Seager, Jennifer	GWSPH	Voting
Sheehi, Lara	CCAS	Voting
Walters-Edwards, Doreen	SEAS Staff	Voting
Waraksa, Elizabeth	LAI	Voting

Wargotz, Eric	SMHS	Voting
Wasserman, Alan	SMHS	Voting
Weitzner, Richard	OGC	Nonvoting
Whitt, Karen	SON	Voting
Zhang, Xiaoke	SEAS	Voting

Research

Member	Affiliation	Voting Status
<i>Sarkar, Kausik*, Chair</i>	SEAS	Voting
<i>McDonnell, Karen, Co-Chair</i>	GWSPH	Voting
<i>El-Ghazawi, Tarek*, FSEC Liaison</i>	SEAS	Voting
Abate, Laura	SMHS Staff	Voting
Applebaum, Kate	GWSPH	Voting
Artino, Anthony	SMHS	Nonvoting
Bosque-Pardos, Alberto	SMHS	Voting
Bukrinsky, Michael	SMHS	Voting
Cohen-Cole, Jamie	CCAS	Voting
Colby, Thomas	LAW	Nonvoting
Cornwell, Graham	ESIA	Nonvoting
Crandall, Keith	GWSPH/CCAS	Voting
Darcy-Mahoney, Ashley	SON	Voting
Downie, Evangeline	CCAS	Nonvoting
Engel, Laura*	GSEHD	Voting
Entcheva, Emilia	SEAS	Voting
Freund, Maxine	GSEHD	Nonvoting
Gomberg-Maitland, Mardi	SMHS	Voting
Hall, Alison	SMHS	Nonvoting
Hyder, Adnan	GWSPH	Nonvoting
Kargaltsev, Oleg*	CCAS	Voting
Kay, Matt*	SEAS	Voting
Kumar, Nirbhay	GWSPH	Voting
Lohr, Gina	Provost	Nonvoting
Lu, Yixin*	GWSB	Voting
Mallinson, Trudy	SMHS	Nonvoting
McNelis, Angela	SON	Nonvoting
Miller, Robert	SMHS	Nonvoting
Norris, Pamela	Provost	Nonvoting
Peng, Yisheng	CCAS	Voting
Pintz, Christine	SON	Voting
Shirrell, Matthew	GSEHD	Voting
Sommers, Hannah	Library	Nonvoting
Subramaniam, Suresh	Provost	Nonvoting
Van Dam, Rob	GWSPH	Voting
Wallington, Sherrie	SON	Voting
Warren, John	CPS	Voting
Wei, Peng	SEAS	Voting

Yang, Jiawen	GWSB	Nonvoting
Yeung, Ellen	CCAS	Voting
Zhang, Grace	SEAS	Nonvoting

University & Urban Affairs

Member	Affiliation	Voting Status
<i>Pittman, Delishia*, Chair</i>	GSEHD	Voting
<i>Cohen, Amy, Co-Chair</i>	CCAS	Voting
<i>Wilson, Arthur*, FSEC Liaison</i>	GWSB	Voting
Bagby, Lisa	SMHS	Voting
Braungart, Carol	SON	Voting
Cheh, Mary	LAW	Voting
Cooke, Jennifer	ESIA	Voting
Das, Bagmi	GSEHD	Voting
Davidson, Leslie	SMHS	Voting
Juni, Robin	LAW	Voting
Marshall, David	CPS Staff	Voting
McPhatter, Renee	Gov. & Community Rel.	Nonvoting
Perez-Gaitan, Anapaula	LAW Staff	Voting
Sudarshan, Sawali	SMHS	Voting
Trimmer, Leslie	GSEHD	Voting
Venzke, Margaret	SON	Voting
Walsh, Jennifer	SON/SMHS	Voting
Ward, Maranda	SMHS	Voting
Wentzell, Erin	SMHS	Voting
Wilensky, Sara	GWSPH	Voting
Wright, Dwayne	GSEHD	Voting
Zink, Christy	CCAS	Voting

*Faculty Senator

**Administrative Committee Appointments
2023-2024**

Appeals Board		Term Ends
Baker, Robert	CCAS	summer 2025
Sullivan, David	SMHS	summer 2025
Ganjoo, Rohini	SMHS	summer 2024
Kasle, Jill	CCAS	summer 2024
University Integrity & Conduct Council		
El-Banna, Majeda	SON	summer 2024
Cobb Kung, Bethany	CCAS	summer 2024
Speck, Erin	CCAS	summer 2024
Gray, Elizabeth	GWSPH	summer 2024
Kleppinger, Kathryn	CCAS	summer 2024
Bronner, Ben	GWSB	summer 2024
Student Discrimination Report Committee		
Cassar, Linda	SON	summer 2024
Core, Cynthia	CCAS	summer 2024
Eglitis, Daina	CCAS	summer 2024
Ellis, Wendy	GWSPH	summer 2024
Geron, Tippi	SMHS	summer 2024
Gonzalez-McLean, Juliana	SON	summer 2024
Kim, Immanuel	CCAS	summer 2024
LeLacheur, Susan	SMHS	summer 2024
Parker, Maggie	GSEHD	summer 2024
Traub, John	CCAS	summer 2024
Zysmilich, Martin	CCAS	summer 2024
Dispute Resolution Committee		
Bukrinsky, Michael	SMHS	April 30, 2024
Core, Cynthia	CCAS	April 30, 2024
Carrillo, Arturo	LAW	April 30, 2024
Clayton, Jennifer	GSEHD	April 30, 2024
Vyas, Amita	GWSPH	April 30, 2024
Pittman, Delishia	GSEHD	April 30, 2025
Bailey, James	GWSB	April 30, 2025
Packer, Randall	CCAS	April 30, 2025
Pelzman, Joseph	ESIA	April 30, 2025
Cseh, Maria	GSEHD	April 30, 2025
Pintz, Christine	SON	April 30, 2026
Garris, Charles	SEAS	April 30, 2026
Stein, Mary Beth	CCAS	April 30, 2026
Schwindt, Rhonda	SON	April 30, 2026
Seavey, Ormond	CCAS	April 30, 2026