



Faculty Senate

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SENATE MEETING
HELD ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2024
HYBRID: 1957 E STREET/STATE ROOM & ZOOM**

Present: President Granberg; Provost Bracey; Executive Committee Chair Feldman; Parliamentarian Binder; Registrar Cloud; Senate Office Staff Liz Carlson and Jenna Chaojareon; Deans Ayres, Feuer, Henry, Lach, Riddle, and Wahlbeck; Interim Dean Perry; Professors Akman, Badie, Bamford, Belenky, Briggs, Brinkerhoff, Cheh, Core, Eakle, El-Ghazawi, Engel, Kargaltsev, Kieff, Kulp, Lu, Marvar, Morant, Mylonas, Orti, Parsons, Rain, Scheck-Ward, Sarkar, Schultheiss, Schwindt, Tielsch, Trangsrud, Vyas, Wagner, Warren, Warshaw, White, Wilson, Wirtz, and Zeman.

Absent: Deans Bass, Goldman, Kelly-Weeder, and Matthew; Professors Borum, Callier, Cseh, Gore, and Kay.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:04p.m.

IN MEMORIAM: PROFESSOR MURLI GUPTA (1946-2024)

Professor Katrin Schultheiss delivered the following statement in memory of Professor Gupta, who passed away on August 19:

“The Faculty Senate, and the CCAS delegation in particular, acknowledges with great sadness the recent passing of our long-time colleague Murli Gupta. Murli was a member of the GW Math Department for over 45 years where he dedicated much of his energy to teaching, and especially to promoting the inclusion of women in math. Most of us here knew Murli for the 22 years that he served as a Faculty Senator. He initially joined the Senate in 1990 and continued to serve until 2007. After a break, he rejoined in 2019 and stepped down only when he retired from the university just this past May. As a Senator he volunteered for numerous committees, most notably perhaps were the eight years that he devoted to chairing the ASPP Committee. Throughout his many years of Senate service, Murli was a steadfast advocate for faculty rights, for fairness, for safety, and for protecting and promoting the central educational mission of the university.

“One colleague on the CCAS Senate delegation, Sarah Wagner, offered the following tribute which eloquently captures the sentiment of so many of us:

‘Four months ago, we congratulated Murli Gupta, our friend and colleague of this chamber, on his much-deserved retirement. Forty-six years he served this university, and it was time to enjoy the fruits of his labor. Murli, had we known, we would have said more: thank you for

the model you provided us of leadership through kindness, competence, and equanimity. For championing the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion, over and over again. For insisting on transparency. And active shooter training. For doing all of this with unflappable goodwill and humility. You will be missed, but your example remains. Thank you, Murli.”

Following the statement, the Senate observed a moment of silence in Murli’s memory.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the May 10, 2024, Faculty Senate meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

INTRODUCTION: SCOTT MORY, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND CHIEF OF STAFF

President Granberg introduced Mr. Mory, who began work in her office in July. She recognized that many in the room have already had the opportunity to work with him and officially welcomed him to his first Faculty Senate meeting. With decades of experience as a dynamic leader in higher education and a deep-rooted connection to GW, Scott has brought a unique perspective to the institution. Mr. Mory noted that he attended several Faculty Senate meetings when he chaired the Student Association Academic Affairs committee as an undergraduate and recalled many collaborative relationships with faculty from that time, including with Professor Gupta. He looked forward to working with the Senate in his new role.

INTRODUCTION: MICHAEL LIPITZ, ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS

President Granberg next introduced Mr. Lipitz, who started at GW in August; he joins GW from the University of Illinois Chicago. His proven experience in athletics, coupled with his expertise in student development and resource management, makes him an ideal fit for GW. Mr. Lipitz stated that he looked forward to meeting and working with the faculty to help GW’s 400 Revolutionary student-athletes become the best versions of themselves.

INTRODUCTION: BOB MILLER, INTERIM VICE PROVOST FOR RESEARCH

Provost Bracey introduced Dr. Miller, who is the vice dean for research and academic affairs with the School of Medicine and Health Sciences. Dr. Miller previously served as vice president for research, and the Provost expressed his gratitude for the depth of Dr. Miller’s expertise during this transitional period.

Dr. Miller noted that he is looking forward to working with the Senate as the university develops a robust research infrastructure supports the recruitment and retention of excellent staff and faculty. To that end, the university must build an efficient, effective, and compliant research program that facilitates the ability of every investigator—faculty and students alike—to develop their full potential in scholarly and research activities. He stated that, in his interim role, he hopes to put many building blocks in place to make this possible and pave the way for the next Vice Provost for Research.

INTRODUCTION: KAREN FROSLID JONES, ASSOCIATE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT

Provost Bracey introduced Dr. Frosolid-Jones, who joins GW from American University and has over 25 years of experience in academic planning and assessment. GW is very lucky to have her on board, particularly as the university prepares for the forthcoming Middle States re-accreditation process, which she just completed at American last year. Dr. Frosolid-Jones noted she is looking forward to working with the Senate (as she did at her previous institution) on many different topics, some directly related to institutional effectiveness and others related to issues of interest specific to faculty.

INTRODUCTION: VANICE ANTRUM, DIRECTOR, MULTICULTURAL STUDENT SERVICE CENTER

Provost Bracey introduced Ms. Antrum, who joins GW from Salisbury University. She has experience in diversity and inclusion, student activities and leadership, residential education, and more. Her broad experience will benefit the Multicultural Student Service Center (MSSC), and the Provost noted he is very pleased that the university has enhanced support for this crucial unit in the GW community.

Ms. Antrum noted that her office hoped that her office would engage closely with faculty in its work as part of the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement. Thus far this year, her office has hosted a panel during new student orientation, an open house, and the annual block party. Her office is also partnering with many areas of the university to bring the MSSC's resources to where the students are. She added that the MSSC office hosts faculty office hours, and she encouraged faculty to reach out to her if they are interested in taking part in that program.

President Granberg requested and obtained unanimous consent to amend the agenda and add an additional introduction by the Provost.

INTRODUCTION: STACY DEAN, CARBONELL FAMILY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, GLOBAL FOOD INSTITUTE

Provost Bracey introduced Ms. Dean, who is an expert in food policy and nutrition with more than 30 years of experience in the government and non-profit sectors. She joins GW from the USDA Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, where she served as Deputy Under Secretary. Ms. Dean appreciated the warm welcome she has received from the GW community. She noted that the Institute's job is to lift up and center the incredible work already being done on food at the university and to give it even more energy.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Ellen Granberg, President)

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

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Professor Wirtz observed that, as today's list of very welcome introductions would indicate, the university seems to be adding substantially to the administration; this would seem to be a very good idea. (He congratulated Mr. Mory, who he noted is an example of a GW student who has done very well.) Administrative salaries as reported by The Hatchet and other media outlets (including the severance paid to former President LeBlanc and former Chief Financial Officer Diaz) as well as the large sums in debt owed to the university (including the substantial amount owed by the Medical Faculty Associates) represent sizable financial obligations. In the context of last year's conversations about travel restrictions on faculty and graduate students, he wondered where funding for these salaries is coming from and whether these compensation commitments are taking a toll on GW's ability to function as academic institution. He asked whether GW's deans are getting the resources they need to be able to promote GW's academic mission.

President Granberg responded that, at every university, even those with extremely strong resource bases, there is always the feeling that there is not enough to go around. She noted that real investments were made this year in the academic organization and that this is always one of the very top funding priorities every year. Other university organizations receive what they need when supporting academics; the university is very mindful of ensuring resources in the academic organization. She stated that GW is currently hampered by a budget model that does it no favors, adding that she is very pleased that the budget model revision process is moving forward. Discussions about this are underway and will continue around how the budget model needs to change in order to best support the academic enterprise. She noted that some of the Senate members present have either already participated or will participate in discussions with Grant Thornton about how GW's budget model needs to change.

Provost Bracey added that GW's schools and academic units could always use more resources—there are more good ideas than money to implement them. He noted that the university did provide a substantial merit increase this year to faculty and staff that rewarded employees for their hard work, including during years when merit increases were not substantial. GW continues to make strategic investments and to think seriously about a new budget model that better aligns with its academic aspirations. There is a clear sense from his conversations with the deans that the model adopted in 2017 needs to be fine-tuned to provide additional resources and support for the academic enterprise.

Mr. Fernandes added that one main focus coming into the FY25 budget was on making investments in faculty and staff: an increased merit pool, equity, and various elements that will make the university more competitive. He noted that GW has substantially improved its attrition rates over the last year and that the university is also looking at benefits investments. He echoed the President's and Provost's remarks that there is more to come on revisions to the budget model. Professor Wirtz reiterated his concern about funding sources for administrative salaries but noted that if the university is ensuring the deans are indeed receiving the resources they need, he is satisfied.

Professor Wirtz next asked about the US Attorney's office stet agreements with students referenced in the President's report. He appreciated the President's compelling argument for the core commitments she outlined as well as the due process for students facing possible sanctions. Acknowledging that he is operating on limited information from the Washington Post, The Hatchet, and the Georgetown Guardian, he asked how students who are allowed to attend classes but are

restricted from accessing university support systems (e.g., Disability Support Services, Gelman Library, on-campus faculty advising) can possibly succeed. He asked who is standing up for these students and what, if any, protestations the GW administration has made to the courts in defense of its students and to say such restrictions, imposed by an external force, are simply not right.

President Granberg addressed Professor Wirtz's underlying question of whether students who accepted these agreements will be able to access the academic resources they need to complete their work this semester. She noted that the Student Support Office and Student Affairs are supporting these students; if a student needs to get something done, those offices are helping them accomplish that. She reiterated that GW did take a neutral position in the US Attorney's process and noted that she was very pleased that there was an opportunity for students to have a clear record at the end of the sanction period. She noted that the university was welcoming to every idea that came across the transom about how to make this workable for the students involved.

Mr. Barber added that he and Provost Bracey had a robust discussion with the Educational Policy & Technology (EPT) committee this morning and went into this in some detail. He noted that there has been misinformation around whether GW is responsible for any perceived inability for students to access necessary facilities. He noted that the US Attorney contacted him (as GW's representative in this matter) and asked for GW's position as the victim of the charge; that office's obligation is limited to consultation. They take GW's position into consideration, but they will make their own decisions. The US Attorney's office asked about certain exceptions (e.g., accessing Metro, health care facilities, classes); the university objected to none of these exceptions as long as the students involved had not been suspended by the university (he added that none of these students were suspended). Mr. Barber noted he was not negotiating with the students' representatives but rather with the US Attorney; he signaled to her that the university would be open to other exceptions as well. He did not hear anything further but did see reports that GW was preventing access to Gelman. He returned to the US Attorney to indicate that the university would be happy to consider any proposals coming from the students' attorneys. However, he noted, only one request came through from the US Attorney on this point, and GW had no objections to that request, responding that the final decision of course rested with the US Attorney. The university made its position clear in response to the US Attorney, respecting the rule of law but also its academic mission and allowing students to continue with their academics under the agreements they negotiated.

Professor Wirtz observed that the students involved are kids who need someone to stand up for them in this. He appreciated the legal process and the US Attorney's jurisdiction in the matter but also expressed his feeling that the university should step in to support these students.

Professor Feldman appreciated that the university took a neutral stance overall while making it clear that these students needed to be able to go to class. However, in the context of the stated importance of strengthening GW's community, and of the university being a residential, immersive experience, she questioned the wisdom of separating these students from the community and wondered whether they are in fact getting that full experience. She expressed that it would be a mistake to separate these things and focus only on classes. She asked whether, if some of these comments are taken on board, there is anything to be done at this point in terms of revising agreements to give students access to a fuller experience. Mr. Barber responded that the university does not have the authority to adjust these agreements; the students and their attorneys could, however, return to court to request amendments if they choose.

Professor Wilson noted that the university's immersive experience and its academic freedom is fragile. He hoped the GW administration would do everything possible to keep the government out of university business, citing not only the US Attorney's involvement in this case but also congressional visits to campus last spring that had a clear political bent.

Professor Schultheiss returned to the question of resources, noting that the history department does not yet have a budget for the year; it was not clear whether this is limited to the department or is a college-wide issue. She was very pleased that staff members received a well-deserved merit pool but also questioned the premise of investments in the academic enterprise where, in her department at least, these investments are not in evidence.

President Granberg clarified that the merit pool increase covered everyone—faculty as well as staff—and that the university saw a drop in staff turnover following this increase. University leadership pushed aggressively for this increase, including negotiating with the Board of Trustees to raise their comfort level with an increased merit pool. The end result represents a significant investment in everyone at the university.

Professor Parsons asked whether there has been a drop in faculty hiring, noting that he saw reports of just ten approved searches as opposed to the usual much higher number. Provost Bracey responded that this information is erroneous—he requested 24-25 tenure-track searches from the Board; several non-tenure-track searches were authorized as well.

Professor Wagner, in thinking about how the university is communicating with community, was struck by Professor Wilson's observation that the university is "fragile" at present. She agreed that there is a sense of fragility on campus at present. She wondered about the President's assessment of the kinds of problems or obstacles that seem to be making the community feel that fragility more acutely. She noted that the EPT dialog today was helpful and relayed important information, regardless of how the various committee members felt about it. She asked the President what about her own deliberations this summer prompted her to say that certain things needed to be done differently. She observed that changes need to happen sooner rather than later; while websites are useful tools for conveying information, they are a communication modality that ends up supporting this sense of fragility.

President Granberg responded that the May Senate meeting really helped put this on the administration's radar. It was very clear at that meeting that the faculty did not feel the administration had communicated well, despite what the administration felt. She noted that it can be easy to miss when a message isn't landing, and that meeting was a clear message that this was exactly what had happened. Opportunities include asking for input; the leadership engaged in conversations over the summer about how to build this into the process to a greater degree. She noted that Mr. Mory's presence on her staff is a big part of that. She heard the need expressed in the May Senate meeting, started asking questions, and then prioritized actions out of those conversations. There is a great deal of excitement on campus as well as the underlying fragility Professor Wagner referenced. The community gets put back together one positive interaction at a time; the decision to visit each college again this year with the Provost is a direct outcome of this and is designed to increase interactions and direct communication. She noted that everyone needs to be respectful of the fact that there is some fragility—and, speaking boldly, that means all in the community, not just the administration.

Professor Sarkar returned to the question of faculty lines, having heard in the School of Engineering and Applied Science (SEAS) that the school is not hiring. Replenishing faculty lines with new hires is critical to generating new ideas and energy. He asked how many new tenure-track SEAS faculty have been hired over the past few years from authorized searches. Provost Bracey responded that SEAS has definitely been hiring, acknowledging that some searches have not yielded candidates. He referred Professor Sarkar to the faculty dashboard (on the [Office of Institutional Research & Planning Internal Dashboards site](#)), which provides data going back ten years. The dashboard can be isolated to the school level to see what hiring has taken place over that period and at what levels. He added that he has not met a chair or dean who hasn't requested additional lines, noting that, ideally, growth or contraction should tie to enrollments. Professor Sarkar responded that he does see many more non-tenure-track faculty lines in SEAS; tenure lines are also important.

Professor Wilson congratulated the administration on the faculty working groups that were convened this summer and hoped that their recommendations might be implemented. He asked why the university is using an external consultant (Grant Thornton LLC) for the budget model revision process when there is internal expertise on the faculty in these areas.

President Granberg responded that Grant Thornton has a long-term contract with GW. It is critical to have an outside agency overseeing budgeting and auditing, and Grant Thornton understands the deep structure of GW's budget very well. She added that the university does not want to create massive upheaval with budget model change. Rather, the administration wants to limit model revisions to just those areas that really need correction. Grant Thornton already knows these systems intimately; as they pull findings from the interviews they are conducting, internal expertise can be tapped to help determine the best options. She stated that she would not want to tap faculty for this work, as the amount of time it would take to educate faculty on the extremely in-depth aspects of the operation would severely hamper their ability to be productive educators and researchers.

Mr. Fernandes agreed that Grant Thornton has an excellent understanding of GW's current budget model and process; with their broad expertise, they can also help align GW to best practices based on what they see on a broader scale. He noted that faculty and staff will be able to participate in this process, but Grant Thornton gets it off the ground.

Professor Wagner asked where in the process GW is at present. Mr. Fernandes responded that he received a presentation today containing a readout of the surveys that have been conducted thus far. This will be presented to leadership next week. The process is moving quickly, but he echoed the President's comment that the university does not want a major disruption to its process; this work needs to be done well. There are some concurrent elements, but the overall process will take some time; he indicated he would share the rollout schedule with the Senate. President Granberg added that the revision of a budget model is at least a 2- to 3-year project. The bigger the change, the longer it takes; therefore, GW wants to do the minimum required to get it right.

Professor El-Ghazawi noted that tying hiring to enrollment is important but observed that GW is also trying to be a premier research institution and needs a strong faculty to do this. He noted that his department has lost several tenured or tenure-track faculty over the past ten years. Retiring faculty are typically high earners at the end of their peak research productivity. Replacing that person would cost less and brings in a faculty member at the beginning of their research life; this should be

part of the equation. Provost Bracey, confirming that Professor El-Ghazawi is the chair of his department, noted that this is spoken like a true department chair.

Professor Mylonas observed that Political Science has witnessed a substantial growth in enrollments, with most classes full and several running waitlists. They could use more lines on that basis alone; this does not even take into consideration the research these faculty are doing. He asked how close the university is to the 75% tenured or tenure-track faculty appointments requirement stipulated in the *Faculty Code*. Provost Bracey responded that this *Code* stipulation refers to 75% of school faculties. Some of GW's schools are above this mark and some below. Overall, the university is below the 75% stipulation and needs to work on this.

Professor Parsons noted that he was involved in an early retirement program 20 years ago at another institution that ultimately found retiring faculty were being paid less than what would be required to hire a junior faculty member replacement.

PROVOST'S REPORT (Chris Bracey, Provost)

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

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PROVOST'S REPORT

Professor Brinkerhoff thanked the Provost for the release of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion action plan. Many have requested this public statement about all the work done on this review for some time. She noted, however, that it is general to the point that it might have been written without all the analysis and input of the review. There are some very specific proposals she is familiar with, having served on the faculty subcommittee, that are completely unaddressed in the action plan. Understanding that this is a public document meant to provide a broader framework for the university going forward, she requested that the Provost's office meet with the faculty subcommittee to have a deeper conversation about the specific proposals that were not included in the action plan.

Professor Orti thanked the Provost for the replies he provided in his report to PEAFF's questions around the demonstrations policy. He asked whether the recently-posted FAQ might possibly be viewed as additions to existing policy, given that the interpretations of policy contained there are not the only possible interpretations of the policy. The Provost responded that the university's position is that the FAQ certainly does not constitute university policy. He offered to clarify any points of confusion around the communicated interpretations offline, and Professor Orti indicated he would reach out following today's meeting.

Professor Feldman observed a gap between the state of finances across the university as opposed to within the academic units. While a long-term solution includes the revision of the budget model and massive fundraising successes, she asked whether the Provost's office might consider stopgap measures for areas of immediate concern. For example, she noted that, while faculty conference travel has been restored, graduate students have still not had travel approved. This is tremendously disadvantageous to these students. Even though this issue rests in the schools, she asked whether the Provost's office might direct some resources to graduate students if the Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (CCAS) is unable to do so.

Noting that it is still early days in the fiscal year, the Provost responded that the first line of defense for this issue is of course at the school level. He stated that he can talk with Dean Wahlbeck about whether there are resources that can be freed up within CCAS for this purpose. In addition, budget adjustments can be made over the course of the fiscal year as projections become firmer. Last year and the year before, he noted, his office did provide some ad hoc relief for graduate students. Despite new needs, there is no new money, and the university needs to be judicious and strategic about where it allocates what it has.

Professor Bamford noted that her department (Romance, German, and Slavic Languages & Literatures) also does not have a budget for the year yet. This makes planning very difficult in terms of hosting speakers and events. She observed that the issue is not only that some departments have not been able to replace tenured faculty who have left: these lines are often filled by contract or specialized faculty. These are not good positions salary-wise in the DC area, observing that one faculty member in her department is earning a \$60K salary for teaching 7 classes; these faculty struggle with morale. This represents another side of the loss of tenure-track lines. Some depts can recoup their teaching staff, but this comes at a loss for those who are hired and for GW's students, who experience higher faculty turnover as a result.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (Ilana Feldman, Chair)

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

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Wirtz asked Professor Feldman to elaborate the idea of an ad hoc faculty sounding board. Professor Feldman responded that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) is seeking input on the best ways to increase the faculty's capacity to be heard and to participate from the very earliest stages in policy development. This must be done with the recognition that early conversations often need to be confidential and that, as determined by the Senate, FSEC cannot operate in that manner. FSEC wants the Senate to talk as a body about ways to create an opportunity for those conversations to happen. She confirmed that nothing specific is planned and that just one possibility is to create an ad hoc committee within the Senate that would serve this function.

Professor Wirtz encouraged FSEC to tread carefully as the perception that there is some kind of special (non-standing) committee with special status could be poorly received. He underscored the importance of bringing that whatever recommendation to the Senate for discussion and approval. Professor Feldman confirmed that the aim is not to have FSEC decide the answer to this question; they would formally propose something through a resolution once the Senate has determined what it wants to do. On the question of consultation, she stressed that such a body would not be "faculty consultation" in the terms shared governance demands. The goal is rather to create some mechanism for the administration to talk with faculty before reaching the policy creation stage. Speaking frankly, she noted that FSEC would be the logical existing committee to do that, but the Senate has thus far decided that this is not an appropriate role for FSEC. The question is therefore

whether there is another mechanism to do this. In fact, the university is seeing the consequences over the last year of not having any faculty body that can participate in pre-policy conversations.

Professor Wilson noted that this is an attempt to find a solution to problem that was apparent last year (around the Board's decision to arm GWPD). Other issues may require confidentiality, and it is important to find a way to involve faculty in those discussions.

Professor Wagner noted that this merits discussion and that the Senate should be thinking about this not just in terms of a consultative body; there might be scenarios where the faculty may want a similar line of discussion going the other way. She was very open to finding a range of channels that do not duplicate work but rather get closer to the faculty expressing things that the administration is not otherwise hearing. This will help build trust.

[RESOLUTION 25/2: ON PROCESS FOR POLICY REVISIONS](#) (Guillermo Orti, Co-Chair, Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee)

Professor Orti moved consideration of [Resolution 25/2](#) and introduced the resolution with the following remarks:

“PEAF has responsibility for the study, evaluation, and interpretation of all administrative policies, contractual provisions, amendments to the *Faculty Code* and *Faculty Organization Plan*, and other matters potentially affecting standards of professional conduct and academic freedom --- matters that have direct potential University-wide effects. You can read about this on the Senate website, where you can also review PEAf reports describing how we engage in these activities.

“On August 5th (17 days before the start of this semester), PEAf was asked by the Provost's Office (AVP Dorinda Tucker) to review a new policy on demonstrations that in our eyes was a significant departure from past policies. Their request stated:

In March of this year PEAf provided feedback to a revised Demonstrations Policy. Since that review, additional edits have been made to address PEAf's feedback and to provide additional clarity and guidance to the GW community in the wake of our experiences this past Spring. As such, please find attached an updated revised Demonstrations Policy.

We hope that PEAf can conduct an expedited consultative review by Friday, August 9th as this is the second look with minimal new revisions.

“The speed at which we were asked to provide feedback was confusing, since we had last commented on revisions to a set of related policies back in March (as stated in the letter). We provided feedback then but had not heard anything since. Therefore, it did not seem that that the process we were engaged in could really be called ‘consultation.’

“As a consequence, we felt that the Senate might want go on record about how we would like to define consultation. This resolution aims to do just this – to define what consultation is. This is a chance for the Senate to be very clear about what is and what is not consultation. I hope my Senate colleagues will support this resolution.”

Professor Feldman relayed a question from Senate office on Resolving Clause (RC) 2, which references proposed policy revisions being posted to the Senate website and the potential for an unintended unfunded mandate. Ms. Carlson explained that, as written, RC2 could be interpreted as a direction to the Senate staff to post policy drafts and collect full faculty feedback on all proposed policy revisions via the Senate website. This could translate to a substantial amount of additional work for which the Senate office is not staffed. Ms. Carlson assured the group that the Senate office would be more than happy to assist in amplifying public comment periods but suggested that the group authoring a given policy revision would be the best host for online public comment.

Professor Schultheiss asked about the exceptional circumstances process in RC7, noting that a Senate resolution would seem to be counterintuitive if circumstances indeed require quick action. Professor Orti responded that the intention of RC7 is to ensure that, should the processes outlined in the resolution not take place, the administration cannot claim faculty consultation. A subsequent Senate resolution outlining the reasons for the exceptional review and confirming that consultation took place would satisfy that requirement.

Professor Tielsch expressed a concern about the informal channels enumerated in RC3 not constituting consultation. He asked what it is, if not consultation, when the administration talks with faculty in various ways about a proposed policy. He noted that no one would pretend that everyone agrees with the advice the Senate gives the administration through even a formal process. In a question of informal vs. formal processes, he noted, the formal processes are stodgy and slow. Professor Orti responded that past administrations have claimed consultation when *only* informal conversations have taken place. While not precluding additional, informal conversations, PEAFF does not want to see this as defining faculty consultation moving forward.

Professor Schultheiss observed that Professor Tielsch's comments about RC3 dovetails nicely with what Professor Feldman communicated in today's FSEC report.

Professor Wilson proposed an amendment to the resolution in the form of a new RC: "Policy proposals or policy modifications such as those related to demonstrations or expressive activity ought to be tabled or withdrawn until there has been adequate consultation as defined above. Accordingly, websites and other formal policy communication forums need to revert to the status quo as of October 1, 2023." The amendment was seconded.

Professor Schultheiss noted that all policies under discussion in these areas are currently existing policies and that the administration is not working with a new policy now. Professor Wilson stated that there is a lot of confusion around whether posted policy interpretations amount to changes. His amendment would set an explicit starting point for any discussions of changes. Professor Feldman asked if the consequences of this amendment, if adopted, would be that entirety of the website around strengthening the GW community could be taken down. Professor Wilson responded that he was not sure whether that would be necessary but was trying to establish a clear starting point for the resolution. Professor Orti noted that, while Professor Wilson's point is well taken, he is in principle opposed to the amendment. The current resolution addresses faculty consultation on all policy proposals and revisions as opposed to any one particular policy; the amendment would distract from the resolution's main purpose.

A vote on the amendment failed with 3 in favor, 15 opposed, and 4 abstaining.

Professor Tielsch suggested that it might be helpful for the Provost to more concisely cite the sources of the policies that have not changed but that are now consolidated in a more concise manner on community website. This might help assuage this concern.

Professor Feldman proposed an amendment to RC2, striking “on the Senate website” to address the earlier expressed concern about whether Senate staff would be responsible for posting policy drafts and tracking faculty public comment on all policy revisions. The amendment was seconded and was adopted unanimously.

Unanimous consent was requested but not obtained for the amended resolution. A vote on the amended resolution passed, 22-1.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No new resolutions were introduced at the meeting.

GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Nominations for membership to Senate Standing Committees
The [attached nominations](#) were approved by unanimous consent.
- II. Senate Standing Committee Reports
 - [Title IX Subcommittee Report](#) (Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom)

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Professor El-Ghazawi, on behalf of the SEAS dean and the school, shared that former dean Gideon Frieder has passed away. Dr. Frieder served as SEAS dean from 1993-1996. He was a visionary colleague and a fantastic mentor who will be missed by many.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:01pm.

Faculty Senate
September 13, 2024
President's Report

Hello and good afternoon, everyone! Welcome to our first Senate meeting of the year. I hope all of your semesters have gotten off to a great start. This is always an exciting time, and it has been wonderful to see our campuses come alive again with renewed energy and enthusiasm.

I am pleased to share some key highlights regarding our student enrollment. This fall, we welcomed more than 2,720 first-year and transfer students into our residential undergraduate community. Their academic achievements, leadership qualities, and commitment to making a positive impact are truly impressive. On opening day, our total student registrations stood at 24,689. This is just two fewer registrations than last fall, demonstrating our continued stability and attractiveness during these trying times in higher education. As of last week, the total enrollment has exceeded 25,000, and we expect additional students to enroll over the coming weeks. The official fall semester enrollment numbers will be available after the enrollment census is completed in October.

Overall, our student body remains a global enterprise, with students coming from all 50 U.S. states and over 130 countries. We are also on track to set a new institutional record for domestic undergraduate students. Currently, we have over 9,700 domestic residential undergraduates enrolled, up from the previous record of around 9,500 in 2018. Part of this increase is due to rising student success and retention rates. For example, just over 92% of last year's class has returned to campus, placing it among our top five all-time retention rates.

Throughout new student orientation week, I enjoyed joining our Dean of Students Colette Coleman, Provost Bracey, Scott, and other university leaders for several of the activities, including a very successful move-in weekend, the New Student Orientation keynote with Dr. Eboo Patel, and the Buff & Blue pep rally. The week culminated in a fantastic Convocation and Day of Service, and I want to thank everyone who joined us to welcome our class of 2028 and new transfer students. By all accounts, this new class has been one of the most active, enthusiastic, and engaged we have seen in years, and I am excited to see what they will achieve on our campuses and in your classrooms.

I also want to thank Chris and his team for conducting an excellent orientation for new faculty and administrative leaders. This included a discussion on shared governance at GW, and I would like to thank Ilana and Trustee Mark Chichester for joining me in that conversation.

Finally, in partnership with the Student Government Association, the Center for Career Services held an expanded Fall Career EXPO this week, hosting 77 employers over two days and attracting over 2,000 students. Employers shared praise about the quality of the GW students and the smooth organization of the fair. A second Career EXPO will be held in the spring semester.

As you know, the last year has also presented its fair share of challenges for both the university and our shared community. As we embark on a new academic year, there continues to be incredible suffering and loss of innocent lives in the ongoing conflict, and many on campus are actively mourning. There are also many hostages who have not been brought home.

These difficult times have deeply divided our community, but these challenges have also brought forth opportunities for growth and improvement. They have allowed us to learn more about what it means to be a GW community, what our strengths are, and where we have opportunities to build a stronger university. For example, we are examining closely how the university communicates during a crisis, how we help our students, faculty, and staff have difficult and productive conversations, and how university-wide decisions are made and shared. Another important outcome was the clear need to align our future planning around a set of core commitments that we can articulate for our community.

To that end, over the summer, we outlined three core commitments to guide our work this fall. They are: respecting the GW community's right to free expression and academic freedom; fostering a safe campus environment; and maintaining the operation of our education and research programs with minimal interruption. While all three commitments are essential, I recognize they exist in tension. As we prepared for this year, it was very rare that a choice to be made did not require some balance among them.

To inform the community of the decisions made and support our community in navigating our existing policies, we launched the next iteration of [GW's Plan to Strengthen our Community](#). This website provides important information for the fall, including existing university safety and security measures, and describes new initiatives designed to enhance our community engagement and conflict education. I encourage everyone to review the site and provide feedback and ideas using the form on the homepage.

New for fall, the site also includes a collection of [resources on expressive activities](#) to help clarify what is and is not prohibited by current GW policy. This includes:

- Examples of the kinds of expressive activities that are and are not permitted on campus;
- Guidance on how to prepare and partake in permitted expressive activities; and
- All the applicable codes and policies surrounding expressive activities.

As we embark on the new semester, I know our community, and many here today, still have questions about the outcomes of the encampment and the student sanctions that followed. Whether you feel they may have been too severe or did not go far enough, I can assure you that these cases have faithfully followed our conduct process, as is the case for all violations of the Student Code of Conduct at GW. When cases like these undergo a panel review, the panel comprises GW faculty, students, and staff to ensure each student is given due process. Additionally, students going through the process can choose to strike members from the panel if they think bias is present. When deciding sanctions, the administration's ability to alter recommended sanctions is limited. While I cannot comment on the specific outcome or details of individual student conduct cases due to federal privacy regulations, I can share that for the majority of students found responsible, the sanctions received were moderate and I think appropriate for the situation. This means, however, that any new or continuing violations of the Code or university policy are likely to result in more serious sanctions.

I'd also like to address the stay-away orders put in place by the United States Attorney's Office for D.C. I know there is disagreement over this outcome, and I want to briefly explain the university's position. In order to provide due process and equity for all our community members, GW decided not to put our thumb on the scale either way. This means we did not take a position on whether the U.S. Attorney and the D.C. courts should impose those orders. We felt this was the U.S. Attorney's decision to make. However, we did make it clear that any enrolled student who has not been suspended by the university should be able to attend classes on campus. We remain committed to supporting all our students and have agreed to nearly every accommodation requested by the Attorney General on behalf of the students subject to the order. The Division of Student Affairs also regularly follows up with them to provide support and care as needed. One thing that is really important about these orders is that, for the students who chose to accept these agreements, their records will be cleared after six months. These students will have access to both mental and physical health facilities on campus. One major benefit of the agreement proposed by the U.S. Attorney is that if they comply, the students' records could be cleared, and we didn't want to interfere with that.

Finally, I know there is also frustration around recently proposed updates to the university's demonstration policies and how that was handled. I want to be clear today that there was no purposeful ill intent in how we proceeded, but, after reflecting on the process, I understand why you are frustrated. Chris will cover this more in his report, but I look forward to discussing how we can improve the process moving forward.

I know the last few months have been challenging for our shared community, and I would like to conclude today by saying thank you for your continued support of our university through the Faculty Senate, this summer's faculty working groups, and as important stewards of the world-class education and research GW is known for. I am looking forward to our continued partnership throughout this next academic year. Thank you, everyone. That concludes my report today, and I will open the floor to questions.



Faculty Senate
September 13, 2024
Provost Report

Good afternoon. It is good to see everyone now that we are back to work and doing amazing things for our students.

First, I'd like to echo President Granberg's praise for our many teams that were responsible for seamless start of year events, including move-in, new student orientation, new faculty orientation, Convocation, and the Welcome Day of Service. Our shared commitment to the success of these events demonstrates to our new students, their families, and our new faculty that we are dedicated to being a welcoming academic community.

I have some additional updates to share today.

Fall Message

A few weeks ago, I sent a message to faculty reiterating the updates and guidance that the president, dean of students Colette Coleman and I shared in our start of semester message, as well as emphasizing the importance of faculty engagement this academic year. With various initiatives underway or forthcoming, including but not limited to the strategic framework process, Middle States accreditation, and outcomes from this summer's faculty-led working groups, it will be critical that faculty across all of GW be highly engaged and continue to advance our academic and research enterprise.

Strategic Framework

Speaking of the strategic framework: We are finalizing the work plan for the strategic framework process this academic year. We are planning for robust faculty representation, supplemented with staff expertise, on the central committee, as well as phases of research and additional community conversations that will ultimately be distilled into a final set of recommendations for the Board of Trustees. Invitations to faculty and staff to serve on the central committee are being distributed today. And as we did previously, we are planning for a dedicated retreat with the faculty senate to work through key elements of the strategic framework. We will share more specific information about the process in the next few weeks and will also launch a standalone website dedicated to the strategic framework, so stay tuned.

Faculty-Led Working Groups

As you are aware, over the summer, President Granberg and I invited faculty to volunteer for working groups, each assigned to a topic related to a community challenge identified over the past academic year. The groups were charged with devising recommendations regarding how students, faculty, and staff can meaningfully contribute to the topic in question. Faculty were encouraged to think broadly and creatively, and to propose at least two or three recommendations to university leadership by mid-August.

We have received reports from all the working groups and are reviewing them to identify recommendations that can be implemented this semester, in the spring, and more long-term. We will share next steps with the community soon.

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Action Plan

Hopefully you saw in today's GW Today email that we have released the [university's diversity, equity and inclusion action plan](#), completed after several years of hard work by the Diversity Program Review Team. A number of the recommended actions put forth by the Diversity Program Review Team are already underway by the university, which makes it clear that we are on the right track to continue building a more diverse, equitable and inclusive scholarly community. I look forward to partnering with the community to further advance this work. Please visit GW Today or the Provost website to read the action plan if you have not yet done so.

School of Business Dean Search

Regarding the School of Business dean search, a new search committee has been appointed and a position description approved by the faculty has been posted. The search firm was recently on campus and held listening sessions with stakeholder groups and all business faculty. This process continues and I look forward to meeting the finalists and making the selection of the next dean of the business school.

Vice Provost for Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement Search

We are also moving forward with the search for a new vice provost for diversity, equity and community engagement. We are meeting with search firms and are in the process of developing the position description. I will share more information about that as it becomes available.

In this interim period, Catherine Guttman-McCabe has joined GW as senior advisor for equity and Title IX compliance. Catherine is a partner at the Potomac Law Group and has more than two decades of experience in employment and education law. Jordan Shelby West, associate vice provost for diversity, equity and community engagement, will continue to lead diversity and inclusion efforts at GW.

PEAF Concerns on Demonstrations Policy

Now, I would like to share some thoughts in response to an email received from the Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) Demonstrations Policy Subcommittee that asked some questions about the proposed clarified demonstrations policy as well as the Free Expression website.

As you likely know, PEAFF first received a draft revised demonstrations policy in February that provided additional clarity around time, place and manner, expectations for compliance, and consequences of non-compliance, along with clear definitions of key terms and links to related information and policies. PEAFF provided feedback on this policy in March.

As we prepared for the fall semester, and in light of the encampment activities in the spring, we felt strongly that the community needed further clarification on our demonstrations policy before the academic year began. Therefore, in early August, we sent to PEAFF a clarified demonstrations policy that addressed PEAFF feedback from March as well as provided guidance around the prohibition of encampments. It is important to note that existing policies, when added together, already rendered encampments a violation of university

policy – these include the **demonstrations policy**, our **disruption of university functions policy**, our **sleeping in public areas of university owned, controlled or leased property policy**, as well the **Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities**. However, we believed that including mention of encampments in the policy was a helpful clarification for the community. The compressed timeline on which the clarified policy was shared with PEAFF was the result of our respecting our principles of shared governance while also working to act quickly to finalize and distribute information ahead of the start of the academic year. We understand that the compressed timeline provided complications for PEAFF, and so we moved forward without making policy changes. Instead, we consolidated our existing policy language on the “Our Commitment” and “Free Expression” sites, with the understanding that further consultation with PEAFF would be required.

I want to reiterate that no changes to the demonstrations, disruption of university functions, or sleeping in public areas of university owned, controlled or leased property policies were ultimately made, in light of these ongoing conversations. You will see on the Policy website that the last material change to the Disruption of University Functions and Demonstrations policies are listed as having been made in 2017. On the Free Expression website, only two material updates were made. The first was the consolidation of the Resources for Expressive Activities at GW into one place - and again, none of the codes, guidelines, or policies linked to in that section are new to GW, nor have they been changed without faculty consultation. The other was the addition of the FAQ about what happens when an individual or group violates a law or university policy. We have heard the concern about the language in this response and will be working with faculty on amending the language.

Regarding the summer faculty working groups: as I shared earlier in my remarks, they were charged with convening and discussing recommendations that could reasonably be implemented this academic year around how the community might engage with each other and with global crises, all while fostering an inclusive and supportive community based on mutual respect, free expression, and critical dialogue. The Free Expression and Community group was asked to consider how the university should foster an environment that permits freedom of expression while preserving a culture of respect and civility. We are in the process of reviewing their recommendations in the context of these recent policy discussions and will report out to the community soon with next steps.

Regarding the concern about how disruptive behavior is characterized in the FAQ, disruptive behavior by a student off-campus that substantially interferes with the normal operations of the university is grounds for applying the GW student conduct process.

As President Granberg, Vice Provost and Dean Coleman and I shared in our start of semester message, we remain deeply committed to free speech, the freedom of assembly, and the right of lawful expression and are committed to working with the faculty to continue advancing these values at GW and engaging in discussions in accordance with our shared governance principles.

This concludes my report.



Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)

September 13, 2024

Ilana Feldman, Chair

FSEC Activities

Over the summer, FSEC advised the Provost on three nonconcurrency cases, in keeping with the processes outlined in the Faculty Code for promotion and tenure. The group also worked with standing committee chairs to issue committee charges for the 2024-2025 session. FSEC also met with the President and Provost following the administration's start-of-term message sent to the GW community in August.

FSEC met on August 30 to arrange the agenda for today's Senate meeting. The group also received updates from the President and Provost as well as reports from the committee liaisons whose committees had summer activities.

FSEC engaged in a productive conversation with the President and Provost about how the administration might best engage faculty in meaningful consultation well before policy decisions are made. Reflecting on the importance of robust faculty participation in the development of university policy and practice, FSEC discussed possible ways to increase this involvement. In addition to the existing mechanisms for consultation on policy through the Senate's standing committee, FSEC sees value in generating opportunities for the administration to benefit from faculty perspectives and knowledge as issues come up and before policies are developed. To that end, we would like to open a conversation with the members of the Senate about possible ways to do this, including considering establishing an ad hoc committee of Senators to serve as a sounding board.

The next joint meeting of the GW Board Executive Committee and FSEC will be held on September 26.

Faculty Assembly

The annual regular Faculty Assembly will be held on Wednesday, October 30, at 4pm. There will be an Assembly resolution to formally approve the last Faculty Organization Plan change approved by the Senate during the last session. To that end, a quorum at this meeting will be extremely important. Please spread the word in your schools and encourage your colleagues to attend this meeting. The meeting will be held in a hybrid format, and virtual attendance will count toward the meeting quorum.

Personnel Actions

There are no active grievances at the university.

Calendar

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is September 20, 2024. Draft resolutions and any other possible Senate agenda items should be forwarded to Liz Carlson in the Senate office as soon as possible, ideally by Wednesday, September 18, to assist with the timely compilation of the FSEC meeting agenda, particularly given that this meeting takes place one week from today. The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting is October 4, 2024.

The Senate office is aware of the conflict of the October Senate meeting with the observance of Rosh Hashanah, which occurs this year from sundown on October 2 and ends after nightfall on October 4. With several other university events during October, including Fall Break and Alumni Weekend, the Senate office was unfortunately unable to reschedule this meeting.



Faculty Senate

Nominees for Standing Committee Membership September 2024

Appointment, Salaries, & Promotion Policies

Linda Briggs (SON), voting/FSEC Liaison

Athletics and Recreation

Scott Kieff (LAW), voting/FSEC Liaison

Micheal Lipitz (Athletics), nonvoting

Mark Mermelstein (Campus Recreation), nonvoting

Educational Policy & Technology

Patricia Dinneen (LAI), nonvoting

Ethan Fitzgerald (SGA), nonvoting

Karen Froslid-Jones (Academic Planning & Assessment), nonvoting

Eric Grynaviski (CCAS), voting

Ethan Lynne (SGA), nonvoting

Karen Singer-Freeman (Teaching and Learning Excellence), nonvoting

Amita Vyas (GWSPH), voting/FSEC Liaison

Fiscal Planning & Budgeting

Jeff Akman (SMHS), voting/FSEC liaison

Libraries

Ilana Feldman (ESIA), voting/FSEC liaison

Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom

John Warren (CPS), voting/FSEC liaison

Phil Wirtz (GWSB), voting

University and Urban Affairs

Arthur Wilson (GWSB), voting/FSEC liaison