



Faculty Senate

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

Present: Provost Bracey; Executive Committee Chair Feldman; Parliamentarian Binder; Registrar Cloud; Senate Office Staff Liz Carlson and Jenna Chaojareon; Deans Ayres, Bass, Feuer, Goldman, Henry, Kelly-Weeder, and Lach; Professors Akman, Badie, Bamford, Belenky, Borum, Briggs, Brinkerhoff, Cheh, Core, Cseh, Eakle, El-Ghazawi, Engel, Hernandez, Kargaltsev, Kay, Kieff, Lu, Marvar, Morant, Mylonas, Orti, Parsons, Rain, Scheck-Ward, Schultheiss, Schwindt, Trangsrud, Vyas, Wagner, Warren, Warsaw, Wilson, Wirtz, and Zeman.

Absent: President Granberg; Deans Matthew, Riddle, and Wahlbeck; Interim Dean Perry; Professors Callier, Core, Gore, Kulp, Sarkar, and Tielsch.

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 8 EXECUTIVE SESSION

The minutes of the November 8, 2024, Faculty Senate executive session were approved by unanimous consent. These minutes will not be made public and will be kept on file with the Senate office.

Professor Feldman offered the following motion: “In recognition of proprietary information that may be raised during the discussion of Vice Provost Goff’s report, I move that the Senate reorder today’s agenda to place Mr. Goff’s report after “Brief Statements and Questions.” This will better accommodate—both technologically and logistically—a possible executive session for the discussion of Mr. Goff’s report. The present motion is only for the purposes of reordering the agenda in anticipation of a later motion for an executive session.”

The motion was seconded and adopted by unanimous consent.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the November 8, 2024, Faculty Senate meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT (Ellen Granberg, President)

In the President’s absence, Provost Bracey delivered the [President’s report](#).

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PRESIDENT’S REPORT

Professor Wirtz referenced a recent Washington Post article yesterday on the Cedar Hill Regional Medical Center, which reported that Cedar Hill chief executive Tony Coleman stated the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA) would dedicate 160 clinicians to the new hospital. Professor Wirtz expressed concern about this report, asking if it was correct. Dean Bass responded that the remarks from Cedar Hill executives included several erroneous statements and that MFA leadership is in the process of determining the best avenues for correcting them; she stated that the reported MFA clinician number was one of those errors. Professor Wirtz asked whether the MFA has commitments in terms of the number of physicians at Cedar Hill. Dean Bass responded that the Cedar Hill staffing plan is not yet complete. Professor Wirtz expressed his concern that, if the staffing plan is not complete, perhaps there are going to be commitments to Cedar Hill; he wondered how this maps onto the concerns about the MFA that have been heard in the Senate and reported by The Hatchet. He asked whether Dean Bass could shed any light on whether this amplifies the concerns the Senate might have about the MFA. Dean Bass responded, “I’m going to say it has no impact on what the concerns have been that have been expressed before.” She added that this matter is being scrutinized and is getting the proper attention at the highest level of the university. Professor Wirtz stated, “If it has no effect, that’s all I need to know.”

PROVOST’S REPORT (Chris Bracey, Provost)

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

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PROVOST’S REPORT

None.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (Ilana Feldman, Chair)

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

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

None.

REPORT: EDUCATIONAL POLICY & TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP REPORT IN RESPONSE TO SPRING 2024 ENCAMPMENT AND RESULTING STET AGREEMENTS (Sarah Wagner & Irene Foster, Co-Chairs)

The [Educational Policy & Technology \(EPT\) working group report](#) was posted with the agenda for this meeting. Professor Wagner

Professor Wagner noted that the report results from an extensive deliberative process that began in EPT’s August 23rd meeting. In that meeting, the committee considered a draft resolution addressing an issue that

had been reported in the news earlier that month—namely, the stet agreements and stay-away orders issued by the US Attorney’s Office for a group of GW students arrested in response to the Spring 2024 encampment.

Committee members decided that more information was needed, and, thus, a working group was established. Eight EPT members volunteered; they were originally told it would be a 2–3-week commitment. It turned into an 11-week commitment. Professor Wagner observed that this was one of the most intense, emotionally draining, and time-consuming tasks she has witnessed in her six years on EPT. The working group’s efforts included hours of meetings held over Zoom as well as a great deal of time spent reviewing emails and documents and queries sent and followed up.

The meetings were not always easy, often entailing difficult, sometimes painful, discussions.

Despite that, the working group, its leadership and its members alike, sought a balanced response and evidence-based approach to the matter. They sought various stakeholder perspectives, maintaining EPT’s central concern of the university’s educational mission at the core of its inquiries and deliberations.

The goal was consensus and a fair-minded presentation of the facts, and the working group’s efforts modeled constructive dialogue and a commitment to shared governance. Most importantly, the working group positioned its efforts as forward-looking, asking the question of how the events of the past several months—and the conflicting accounts and understandings of those events—might inform the university’s future responses and actions.

Next, Professor Wagner provided a brief overview of the report:

Initial steps of information gathering

- (1) Launching off point: needed more information (news reports insufficient)
 - What was the actual content of the stet agreements and stay-away orders?
 - What was the Office of General Counsel and Provost’s account of events?
 - What was the affected students’ account of events?
- (2) The working group’s primary information-gathering efforts included:
 - Reviewing copies of the student stet agreements: Description of stet agreements and how the USAO uses them is Appendix 2;
 - Sending questions to General Counsel Charles Barber and Provost Bracey, with an invitation to speak to the full committee, which they did on September 13 (the meeting minutes are included in Appendix 3);
 - Receiving statements from six affected students and two defense attorneys: Individual and collective timelines of those accounts are provided in Appendices 6 and 7.
- (3) The working group realized the need for additional information after hearing student accounts:
 - Sent questions to the Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, Colette Coleman, regarding academic support for affected students (Appendix 8);
 - Follow-up questions to GC Charles Barber about stet agreements (Appendix 9).
- (4) The working group also consulted:
 - Other committees (GW and Congress) reporting on related matters;

- Relevant GW policies.

Summary of findings

The more the working group sought information, the more it became clear that there was a disjuncture between the various stakeholders' accounts.

For example, on the one hand:

- The General Counsel holds that GW was neutral on the stet agreements and stay-away orders and, when asked by the USAO, was open to requests for location exemptions for student academic pursuits—that is, requests made through the USAO.
- The affected students disagree, holding that statements from the USAO suggest that GW OGC *was* involved in setting and maintaining the stay-away order boundaries, and those stay-away orders displaced some from on- and even off-campus housing, as well as from accessing resources critical to their education.

Another example relates to student support:

- Student Affairs holds that the Student Support Office has provided support as needed to affected students.
- The affected students hold that they have *not* been contacted by Student Affairs or ODECE.

The report's appendices illustrate these discrepancies in much greater depth. However, the working group's and EPT's aim is forward-looking.

Professor Foster reviewed the [working group's recommendations](#) and thanked the eight members of the working group especially its leadership—co-chairs Mountasser Kadrie and Lisa Schwartz—for the extraordinary effort they put into producing such a balanced presentation of the information they gathered.

Before opening the floor to questions and discussion, Professor Wagner noted that, at its November 13 meeting, EPT voted unanimously in support of the working group's report.

Professor Wilson asked about “politically neutral” interim suspensions in the second recommendation. Professor Wagner noted that the group spoke extensively with the director of the office that was previously known as “Student Rights and Responsibilities” and is now known as “Conflict Education and Student Accountability” (CESA—notable in the removal of “rights” from the office name). One question they asked centered on interim suspensions and how often they have been used over the past five years. Specifically, the working group was interested in how often interim suspension is a possible, and then applied, sanction and how often it was used as part of the determination of whether a student posed a threat to the campus community. The group was very frustrated and surprised to hear from CESA that they do not have those records for the past five years and that, if there were interim suspensions, the numbers are statistically insignificant. The group very much hopes that, going forward, CESA can keep track of this information. Students want to be able to understand what “posing a risk” means, particularly in the context of the 2024 demonstrations and looking ahead to the likelihood of future demonstrations.

Professor Wilson clarified that his question was about whether there was a concern that interim suspension was a sanction that could be imposed without adjudication. Professor Wagner responded that this was not a concern but that the group was worried about the use of interim suspension as a tool to remove

“bothersome” people from campus. Professor Wilson asked what “politically neutral” means in this context. Professor Wagner responded that this is meant to convey that the context of a demonstration, and the particular political messaging of a demonstration or protest, is not basis on which interim suspension is being used.

Professor Feldman thanked EPT and the working group for this tremendous effort. From a forward-thinking perspective, she asked what issues are at stake and what potential rethinking of university policy might be warranted. She noted that the report and other conversations on this issue reveal the fact that the university faces a challenge in balancing a concern for its established policies, procedures, and the need to follow the rules of the community with its even more fundamental obligation to support students’ academic success. That balance does not always seem to be appropriately aligned; this is part of what comes through in the working group’s report. In addition to the very specific suggestions in report, GW needs, as an institution, to reflect on how to get that balance more correct. Even as one cannot disregard rules by which the community lives, how can the institution establish mechanisms to promote and support compliance with those rules on the bedrock of the most important thing it does, which is supporting its students’ education? Any action that undermines that support should be a last resort. She recalled a recommendation emanating from this summer’s faculty working groups to review and potentially reform the student code of conduct to provide more clarity to students about the potential consequences of any action they take. Currently, for flexibility, every sanction is technically on the table for every action; this does not give students sufficient guidance about, essentially, what risks they may want to undertake and what real consequences they may face. She asked whether the working group talked about any macro-level recommendations along these lines.

Professor Wagner responded that the working group’s purpose was fact-finding and then determining what cautious, tentative recommendations it might make around this issue. She emphasized that EPT voted for this report to come forward precisely to generate discussion and feedback in order to determine what the next steps should be and what changes should be made. She noted that EPT spent some portion of its discussion today looking at the Code of Academic Integrity and the necessity to extend the addendum that was brought forward previously as a mitigation strategy for the bottlenecking of academic integrity panels; this will come to the Senate in January. This is a direct result of how artificial intelligence is affecting the academic integrity code. As well, the university is in a moment of different types of political discourse. Suggestions in this broad area are welcomed by EPT, who will also bring them to CESA. Professor Foster confirmed that this is exactly why they are presenting this report—so that they may take suggestions about next steps back to EPT.

Professor Warren expressed his appreciation for the working group’s efforts and asked, beyond the clear and straightforward recommendations outlined in the report, what next steps the group recommends. Professor Wagner responded that she and Professor Foster would bring all feedback on the report to EPT, and specifically to the working group membership. She stressed that EPT is adamant in ensuring it talks through these topics and votes on them collectively. The committee welcomes input, and she added that anyone who feels invested in this discussion is welcome to join the conversation in the new year, after the working group gets a break.

Referencing the second recommendation, Professor Badie noted that the word “politically” is challenging to use as it means different things to different people. He suggested that a word like “nonbiased” might be better in this case. Professor Wagner responded that she would take this suggestion back to EPT and the working group, agreeing that language needs to be clear regardless of the context.

Professor Parsons noted that the premiere thing the university wants is to maximize the educational experience of its students and that the situation that led to this work resulted in one set of students disrupted the ability of another set of students to do that. In determining what the penalty for that should be, the goal should be to maintain the maximum amount of educational access. He stressed the importance of finding balance of the two; that framework is important to keep in mind. The university wants all of its students to have the best education possible; when there is conflict, it should seek to minimize disruption of the whole. Professor Wagner heard this as aligned with Professor Feldman's comments, which included students having clear knowledge and expectations of that framework. She added that, in the specific instance that prompted the creation of the working group, where stet agreements and stay away orders were imposed, those sanctions in some instances limited students' access to educational and academic support resources.

Professor Eakle observed that the third recommendation encompasses a recommitment to existing principles; he asked whether the other recommendations involve extensions of existing policies, noting that he did not see anything especially novel. Professor Wagner responded that she could not recall stet agreements and stay away orders making national news, or an encampment on the GW campus; it was a set of novel circumstances that brought this situation into being. The report represents a modest attempt at setting out some recommendations in response to that novel situation and to look to the future. Professor Foster added that this issue came to EPT via faculty members who were concerned that students were losing access to educational resources as a result of the stet agreements and stay away orders; that was primary concern and the context in which EPT began looking at the matter. The other reason this became relevant, she noted, was through EPT's work with academic integrity and finding a lack of data on interim suspensions. There is a recommendation that the university collect this data going forward and make it available when needed. In addition, she affirmed that the committee has worked very hard on shared governance; when matters relate to the educational mission, EPT would like to work with GW leadership on what should be done in those circumstances. Professor Eakle asked whether that is part of the *Faculty Code* as it is already written. Professor Foster responded that sometimes things existing in the *Code* need to be amplified.

Professor Wirtz noted a concern that reports often end up being just that and nothing more. In an effort to avoid that in this case, he offered a recommendation. He stated that he has prepared a resolution that can be introduced on the Senate floor today, should the Senate be willing to change the agenda, that would endorse the recommendations in the working group report. Before moving this addition to the agenda, he wondered if this was something to which the Senate would be amenable. Professor Parsons objected to changing the agenda to consider a new resolution. Professor Wagner added that EPT was clear in its deliberations and unanimous decision about wanting to bring this report to the Senate in order to generate feedback and more recommendations. This process would result in a better resolution coming back to the Senate, and she affirmed that such a resolution would be forthcoming. Professor Wirtz emphasized this point, putting the Senate on notice that this issue will return to the Senate floor.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

None.

GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Nominations for membership to Senate Standing Committees
 - Professor Eakle, FSEC liaison to the Physical Facilities & Campus Safety committee, nominated Seth Weinschel, Associate Vice President for Business Services, as a non-voting member of the committee. Unanimous consent was requested and obtained for the nomination.
- II. Nominations for membership to the Benefits Advisory Committee
 - Of the two nominated faculty members to join the Benefits Advisory Committee, Professor Afkhami has unfortunately had to withdraw from consideration due to scheduling conflicts. There is therefore still one open at-large faculty slot on the committee, and Senate members are encouraged to send any suggestions for nominations to the Senate office as soon as possible. Unanimous consent was requested and obtained for the approval of Professor Bamford's nomination to the Benefits Advisory Committee.
- III. Senate Standing Committee Reports

Interim reports have been received from the following committees:

 - [Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies](#)
 - [Athletics & Recreation](#)
 - [Libraries](#)
 - [Physical Facilities & Campus Safety](#)
 - [Research](#)

Chairs of the remaining committees are asked to submit their interim reports to the Senate office as soon as possible.

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Professor Wagner reminded the Senate that the Ally tool in Blackboard will be available via an opt-out pilot program in the Spring 2025 semester. Libraries and Academic Innovation (LAI) will be sending out information to help faculty understand and work with this tool, which is designed to help faculty increase the accessibility of their online materials. She asked the Provost if he might include information about Ally with his start-of-term message to faculty in January; he responded that he would do so.

Professor Orti relayed that the Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) has recently engaged in discussions of institutional neutrality given the rise in interest in this topic, both at the national level and on the GW campus. A recent Hatchet editorial stated that GW is not considering adopting a position of institutional neutrality; are there ongoing discussions about this with the Board of Trustees and/or within the administration? Professor Orti also asked how the concept of institutional restraint contrasts with institutional neutrality.

Provost Bracey responded that university leadership is preparing for discussions about whether GW should adopt a position of neutrality or restraint. Leadership plans to talk with the Board and to bring in experts on the topic for these discussions. There will be more coming on this, and the Provost expected that leadership would want to hear from the faculty on these issues. Professor Wilson asked whether any presentations from experts might be shared publicly. The Provost responded, if presentations are made to the Board, the Board would have to determine whether those might be made more widely available. Professor Feldman asked that the Senate be engaged in these conversations (via PEAF) well before the point of a decision.

REPORT: ANNUAL REPORT ON ENROLLMENT (Jay Goff, Vice Provost for Enrollment and Student Success)

Vice Provost Goff's presentation was posted with the agenda for today's meeting. Mr. Goff reviewed the report, offering the following remarks:

Thank you for inviting me to present the annual update on enrollment and student success. It's a pleasure to return and share positive news. The good news continues to be that our overall enrollment has met and, in some cases, exceeded projections, despite the significant challenges facing higher education—including demographic shifts, economic uncertainties, and national disruptions like the FAFSA delays. GW's enrollment trends have remained on track with our post-pandemic enrollment objectives that we outlined in our five-year strategic plan.

Today's presentation builds on data and discussions we've shared in previous Faculty Senate meetings, EPT committee reviews, and other faculty leader discussions this fall.

Our work is guided by our Vision and Mission for the Division of Enrollment and Student Success. This is anchored in three key pillars that have been regularly emphasized by the President and Provost:

1. Maintaining academic excellence.
2. Fostering access and a diverse student body.
3. Ensuring affordability for students while generating the revenues necessary to sustain GW's academic quality and global reputation.

The total enrollment this fall exceeded 25,300 students, slightly surpassing our early September projections. Key highlights included:

- Residential full-time undergraduate student enrollments grew by 3.8%, a record increase.
- Domestic residential undergraduate enrollment set a new record with 9,707 students.
- Undergraduate retention rates have returned to pre-pandemic levels with just over 92% of the fall 2023 first-year student re-enrolling in fall 2024.
- Full-time graduate enrollment also experienced growth this fall.

Although we had success with many of our strategic goals, some persistent challenges continued in this fall's total enrollment trends. These include lower part-time enrollments among working adults, mostly in masters levels programs, and a continuing decline in Chinese international students. The lower number of students from China have been somewhat offset by growth in students from other countries throughout the world. This will be the third year in a row that we have increased international students from over 20 other countries.

As I discussed last spring and again in November, we have spent considerable time in changing our enrollment management plans to navigate many issues that have disrupted national and international student enrollment trends. Several significant disruptors impacted enrollment this year, with two major changes:

1. The Supreme Court ruling on race-conscious admissions required a swift and compliant adjustment of processes.
2. The FAFSA delay created national uncertainty.

We mitigated these challenges by utilizing internal financial aid, leveraging strategies, and managing a multi-stage waitlist program, which was originally developed in collaboration with the Future Enrollment Planning Task Force. Unlike many peer institutions, GW achieved its new undergraduate student enrollment goals this fall, and the total undergraduate enrollment grew for the fourth year in a row.

Our five-year plan, developed during the pandemic, addresses short-term challenges while maintaining a long-term focus. The goal is to position GW's enrollment profile and student success levels to allow the university to be recognized as a Top 50 national research university.

The strategic enrollment planning work is executed by a dedicated leadership team, covering pre-college programs, undergraduate admissions, financial aid, graduate enrollment, career services, and broader student success initiatives. We truly have some of the best individuals helping our students and rethinking the way we do things in the current environment.

Strategic investments include:

1. Upgrades to the Banner ERP system.
2. Implementation of the Slate CRM system (a higher education gold standard).
3. Expansion of student services offered through the Student Services Hub.

GW remains majority post-baccalaureate (54% graduate/professional students; 44% undergraduate). 77% of students are enrolled full-time, reflecting our focus on traditional, degree-seeking pathways. With 18,700 full-time students, we are just 0.6% below the fall 2019 full-time enrollment levels.

Our National and Global Reach remains strong. We have students from all 50 US states and many US territories. Nearly half (48%) of our students come from six regions: Virginia, Maryland, New York, California, New Jersey, and DC. Current GW students represent 142 countries, with continued growth in global diversity.

Our incoming undergraduate class met the target enrollment and maintained GW's high academic profile (mean GPA and test scores are similar to past five years). Like other universities, we did see continued growth in the number of new students selecting test-optional admissions. Our initial data tracking shows similar and strong success outcomes for these students.

Admissions processes followed all required compliance protocols under the new 2023 Supreme Court decision (Students for Fair Admissions). All race and ethnicity data were masked from the faculty and staff participating in the admission application review and decision-making processes. This was confirmed by the overview Task Force charged by the Provost.

The new admissions process yielded mixed results for undergraduate, graduate and professional programs. For residential undergraduates, we experienced an increase in underrepresented (URM) students (22% in fall 2023 to 25.7% in fall 2024). We also experienced a growth in new undergraduate Pell Grant recipients (17% in fall 2023 to 20% in fall 2024). This change was largely due to the changes in the FAFSA aid formulas that allows for more students to qualify for partial Pell grants.

The new Department of Education (DoE) College Scorecard has been released. Our average five-year graduation rate now listed at 84%, well above the 58% national six-year college graduation rate. The DoE report also shows the median earnings for GW graduates at just over \$90,800 after 10 years, compared to a national median of about \$53,600.

The Career Services team is implementing a six-stage career success program that will bridge career readiness programming from our pre-college programs through alumni outreach efforts. The overall student success efforts are aligned with our strategic goals and are designed to improve graduation rates, job placements, average salaries, and lower student debt.

The “Only at GW” Personalized Core Experience Portfolio App pilot (Core-in-4 app) collects information from the schools, departments and faculty leads to highlight departmental strengths, research opportunities, and unique GW experiences for prospective and current students based on their major.

The new Core Experience Portfolio (CORE-in-4) is a customizable experience-planning tool designed to increase new students’ engagement with unique GW experiences, and enrollment yield of new first-year students admitted to the University. The program includes an online, user-friendly outreach application and data collection platform for prospective first-year undergraduate students admitted to one of the five residential schools. It can be utilized on a smart-phone or desktop computer and will provide each student with a personalized eight semester planning guide (in electronic and PDF form) that combines curriculum with the following core and high impact GW experiences: 1. study abroad, 2. internships, 3. community service, 4. entrepreneurial activities, 5. research, and 6. potential graduate programs. Faculty in each major will provide recommendations for the core experiences.

The QR code in the slides will allow the Senate to test current platform, and we welcome feedback. We expect to fully launch the Core-in-4 app across all residential colleges by March 25, 2025.

With big thanks to our donors and the Development and Alumni Relations team, we raised \$32 million last year for need-based scholarships. These new financial aid awards have helped reduce our students’ student loan debts and have increased access for students with financial need.

GW has made significant strides in recovering from the pandemic, overcoming new challenges, and positioning itself as a leader in enrollment and student success. We remain committed to maintaining academic excellence, fostering diversity, and ensuring affordability.

Our enrollment success is a testament to the collaboration between faculty, staff, and administration. Together, we’ve maintained progress on our enrollment objectives and supported student success in challenging times. Thank you for your continued partnership and support, and I look forward to answering your questions.

Following Mr. Goff’s presentation, Professor Feldman offered the following motion:

“In recognition of proprietary information that may be raised during the discussion of Vice Provost Goff’s report, I move that:

1. the Senate move into executive session for a discussion of Vice Provost Goff’s report;
2. minutes be kept and maintained as for previous executive sessions;

3. the following individuals be invited to attend: Chief of Staff Mory, Vice President Post, Provost Bracey, General Counsel Barber, Vice Provost Goff, CFO Fernandes, Vice President Moran, all deans, Parliamentarian Binder, Vice Provost Murphy, Registrar Cloud, Senate Office staff Carlson and Chaojareon; and members of the EPT enrollment subcommittee: Thomas Choate, Jamie Cohen-Cole, Eric Grynawski, Irene Foster, Tobe Frierson, Ben Toll, Barbara von Barghahn, and Kimberley Williams; and
4. time in executive session be limited to 30 minutes, at which point the Senate will vote to adjourn.”

The motion was seconded.

Professor Wagner objected to the motion on the issue of transparency, noting that discussions of the enrollment report have not been held in executive session previously. In addition, due to the short notice of the planned motion for an executive session, some members of the EPT enrollment subcommittee who would have attended were not able to make arrangements to do so. If the discussion is held in executive session, those individuals will not have the benefit of reading the minutes of the discussion later.

Professor Feldman noted that Mr. Goff suggested an opportunity to engage in a discussion that could not be held in an open session and made himself available for that purpose; when discussing this, FSEC felt it was their responsibility to bring that to the Senate as the Senate makes the determination about going into executive session. She added that specific questions have already been raised in previous sessions about myriad issues facing universities in general and GW in particular in the years to come. GW’s response to these questions include data that is proprietary and cannot be discussed publicly. An executive session therefore provides an opportunity for the Senate to hear this information (as EPT and the enrollment subcommittee already have).

Professor Wirtz noted that there is a question of how the Senate going into executive session appears to faculty colleagues. At last month’s meeting, he did not object to an executive session on the understanding that the Senate would be hearing privileged information that would not be shared publicly. However, that evening the university made that information public, rendering the executive session moot. His question about today’s motion is whether there is in fact content to be discussed that would require an executive session.

Mr. Goff explained that, at the last Senate meeting, there was a brief discussion around strategies to achieve the goal of a 90% graduation rate within ten years. That discussion edged toward questions about markets GW might look at to create certain opportunities for the university as well as what are trends he is seeing in terms of the market, politics, and other factors. The answers to those questions include details that he would not release in a public manner as they would tip the university’s strategic hand. This is important information in terms of how the university leadership positions GW in a very competitive student environment, and it could prove valuable for faculty leadership to understand these strategic efforts. Having this information changes one’s understanding of the overall strategy and positions faculty to help realize that strategy.

Professor Wagner noted that the question she wanted to ask was meant to be asked in an open forum so that it would be part of the public minutes; she would like the broader community to have the benefit of her question on today’s report. The Parliamentarian observed that a vote on the present motion, should it be unsuccessful, would not preclude another motion for an executive session after open discussion of the report.

A vote on the motion failed, 10-12.

Professor Wagner extended her congratulations to Mr. Goff, Mr. Toll, and their team on the incredible work they have done in this area. She noted that her questions come out of the discussion in today's EPT meeting, where Mr. Goff discussed the material brought to the Senate today. First, she asked what the enrollment team needs in order to face and combat what seem to be increasingly large national headwinds for universities. Second, given the importance of international students to GW and the challenge of the incoming administration, does Mr. Goff's team have sufficient resources and staffing for recruiting international students in this environment?

Mr. Goff stated that Ben Toll and the admissions team deserve a great deal of credit for how they managed the FAFSA crisis this past summer. He noted that his team has the right plan for the winds they know about already. He observed that today's students want more communication, more personalization, and the best experience possible for their investment. To this end, his team is testing multiple projects to develop more meaningful communication with prospective students and reflecting the true GW to that population. Continued fundraising also remains important. He added that he would have a better sense of the adequacy of current resources around April.

On the international side, Mr. Goff noted his reluctance to speculate based on the past; there is a lot of uncertainty about what will happen. The good news is that current application trends are on track for both undergraduate and graduate targets. He affirmed that his team has a plan that can be implemented in different ways depending on what happens in this area.

Professor Eakle was impressed by the personalized experience portal and asked to what extent the university is taking advantage of AI technology in identifying potential matches with students. Mr. Goff noted that, when navigating the FAFSA issue, the team did an incredible job of manually entering every update through the process. This was possible because of the availability of the right data, and the team did an amazing job in an emergency situation. A similar environment exists when it comes to AI. The personalized student portfolio project ("Core in 4") is being built out through data collection from faculty and departments. This is a data stacking exercise as opposed to a machine learning process. The university will be able to use faculty-approved content in a data lake—this could be implemented via an AI product, but the institution has to be able to ensure it has proven control over the quality of the data. He stressed the importance of caution in using outreach technology, which needs to be accurate.

Professor Wilson asked how close GW is to the DC enrollment cap and whether this is a concern going forward. Mr. Goff responded that the university is close to the cap but beneath it. GW is close enough to the cap that it is probably time to look at how some classes are distributed; the university will look at ways to remain fully compliant from a planning standpoint. A broader discussion is on the table about whether the cap might be amended.

Professor Warshaw asked whether the cap includes masters students and how this affect the Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (CCAS), which is actively trying to increase its masters enrollments. Mr. Goff responded that this depends on where the classes are taught. Graduate enrollment does have to be included in the cap calculation, and this is complicated. On a specific program basis, most of GW's graduate programs have the flexibility to grow if there is instructional support capacity to support that growth.

Mr. Barber added that the enrollment cap is a zoning concept and applies to Foggy Bottom; this is an unusual arrangement. When the cap is applied, the calculation has to consider the Foggy Bottom campus,

not the Mount Vernon or other campuses. This requires careful management to be sure it is applied correctly.

Professor Schultheiss asked how GW's enrollment fared this year as compared to other regional universities and how Mr. Goff anticipated this going in the future. Mr. Goff responded that, while he would not comment on other schools, those numbers are searchable online. GW performed very well, exceeding its target. He agreed that an increased retention rate and very hard work around the FAFSA are major drivers for GW's enrollment successes. In addition, he noted that the work done by the Future Enrollment Task Force in 2021-2022 has led to GW's present successes. The task force thought it was preparing for the demographic cliff anticipated in 2027-2029, but its good strategic work paid off this year as well. It is impossible to model something that hasn't happened before, and having the right faculty and staff involved on the task force was key to the model working as well as it did.

Professor Wagner noted that anyone interested in this work is welcome to come to the EPT enrollment subcommittee.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:07pm.

Faculty Senate Meeting

December 13, 2024

President Granberg's Report—Read by Provost Bracey

Good afternoon, everyone. I hope you all had a wonderful Thanksgiving break and your preparations for finals and the holiday season are going well.

I am sorry that I won't be able to join you today. I've been under the weather for much of the week, and I appreciate your understanding.

The last month has been filled with several opportunities to celebrate the accomplishments of our faculty, students, staff, and the broader GW community, and I would like to start my report today by sharing some of those highlights.

In early November, I joined the GW medical community to celebrate GW's School of Medicine and Health Sciences' Bicentennial anniversary and our remarkable MD alumni. From the Heart, Brain, and Skin events in spring to last month's Bicentennial Symposium and Reunion Weekend, the celebrations have truly showcased SMHS' excellence and growing reputation.

Later in the month, I joined our phenomenal staff members to recognize and celebrate those who have reached significant career milestones at GW, including 5, 10, 15, 20, and, in one case, over 50 years of service at our university. The incredible experience, expertise, and dedication these employees bring to GW continue to support all our work every day, and I am so grateful for their contributions.

I have also spent some less formal time meeting with and talking to our community.

I've enjoyed sharing several meals and conversations with students in the Thurston and Shenkman dining halls, connecting over food and hearing about how they spend their days on campus. I want to give a special thank you to the dedicated teams that take such great care of our students every day.

I also continued my classroom visits by joining Professor Rodney Lake's Applied Securities Analysis class. This undergraduate class manages over \$3.4 million in GW's endowment funds and showed the value of this real-world experience through the energy and expertise they brought to their buy/sell pitches Scott and I got to see.

Provost Bracey and I are also in the process of visiting all of our schools and colleges to speak with faculty and staff. In addition to this, I am joining many of our divisions and units for Q&A sessions, beginning with a great chat with Ellen Moran's Communications and Marketing team last month and Colette's Division of Student Affairs this week.

Finally, last week, I was in Austin for a salon dinner with alumni and prospective donors, which included a great conversation with Professor Zoe Szajnfarber from GW's School of Engineering and Applied Science and the Director of Strategic Initiatives at SEAS.

Zoe and I joined our guests in a fantastic conversation about artificial intelligence and the future of AI research at GW. This was a great example for our Texas community of the unique role our university plays in connecting science, technology, and innovation with law, policy, and ethics.

This dinner was the second in a series of similar engagements we're planning across the country, and I look forward to sharing more about these events as they take shape.

As always, I appreciate the opportunity to speak with and hear directly from our GW community, and I look forward to even more of these opportunities in the new year.

I'd now like to turn my attention to a few university updates.

First, I want to share that we have taken steps to rethink and reorganize the GW leadership structure.

We set out on this task to find a way to more effectively bridge the gap between the academic and administrative sides of the university's leadership teams to foster deeper collaboration, mutual understanding, and strategic alignment.

As a result, we now have a GW cabinet comprised of 14 university leaders, which meets once a week to advise on critical issues; an Executive Leadership Team, which meets monthly and includes all vice presidents, vice provosts, and academic deans; and a new GW Leaders Forum, which will meet three times a year and include approximately 300 academic and administrative leaders from across the university.

This new structure is already strengthening leadership collaboration across the university, and I look forward to having more opportunities to better align our work.

I also want to provide you all with an update on the ongoing GWPDP investigation.

The investigation firm is nearing the end of document review and interviews. We expect a report to be delivered to my office in mid-January, at which point it will be shared with the GW Cabinet and then with the Board of Trustees. We are working towards having that done by their February meeting.

After the presentation to the Board, we will collect their feedback and publish a report summary for the campus community. We expect that to happen by the end of March.

Next, I am also pleased to share two important partnership opportunities that will put GW in more of the rooms we need to be in to move the university forward.

Earlier this fall, GW secured a position on the Northern Virginia Technology Council Board of Directors. Our university used to have a seat on this board, and I am glad we could regain it.

The NVTC is one of the nation's largest and oldest tech councils. It convenes regional tech companies, from start-ups to Fortune 100 companies, government contractors, service providers, academic institutions, and nonprofits, who are all committed to improving how we live, work, and learn in the national capital region.

GW has also accepted an invitation to join the Greater Washington Partnership. The Partnership, founded in part by former GW Board Chair Russ Ramsey, is an invitation-only association of influential cross-sector employers in Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, DC. This is a fantastic partnership opportunity for the university, and I look forward to contributing to the group's shared mission of economic growth and inclusive prosperity in the region.

Finally, I want to conclude by announcing an exciting "Only-at-GW" opportunity for our students at the beginning of the Spring Semester.

On January 14, 2025, we will welcome Dr. Arati Prabhakar, Assistant to President Biden for Science and Technology and Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, to GW's campus for her talk titled "A Better Tomorrow: Science and Technology's Essential Purpose."

Dr. Prabhakar will explore how we can use today's tremendous advances in science and technology to build the future we all aspire to. She'll guide us through recent significant progress and vital priorities ahead—from addressing climate change and advancing healthcare to navigating the transformative AI revolution and beyond.

Formal announcements will be sent soon, but I hope you all will join me in spreading the word to our students about this fantastic opportunity.

Thank you, everyone. That concludes this report, and I look forward to joining you at Monday's holiday reception.



**Faculty Senate December Meeting
Provost Bracey Report
Friday, December 13, 2024**

Good afternoon. It is wonderful to see you all for the final Faculty Senate meeting of the calendar year, and as such, I will keep this short and sweet.

End of Semester Notes

First, a few notes about the end of the semester.

We are focused on helping our students finish the semester strong. As many students are in the midst of final exams, stress and anxiety are high. Vice Provost and Dean Colette Coleman and I sent an encouraging message to students earlier this week with information about Academic Commons, Lerner Health and Wellness, and more.

Of course, you would have also seen a message from me this week with thanks for your continued engagement and commitment to GW. As part of that message, I shared a brief reminder about grading. Faculty are required to submit final grades within five (5) business days after the final examination or after the final class meeting if no exam is given. Final grades should be submitted no later than Tuesday, December 24.

Strategic Framework

As you know, the strategic framework process continues. Since mid-November, we have held eight conversations with faculty and staff groups, and just this week we hosted two engaging student conversations. These conversations have given participants a status update on the strategic framework process and an opportunity to review and discuss some of the ideas submitted by community members for consideration.

The information gleaned from all these conversations will inform the Innovation Committee's draft report that it will submit to the Steering Committee. I would like to thank the Innovation Committee, Steering Committee and all members of the community who have participated in these crucial conversations, and we look forward to next steps in this process in the spring semester.

School of Business Dean Search

We recently hosted several impressive School of Business dean candidates on campus to meet with various groups of stakeholders and are hopeful about a positive outcome of this search. I would like to thank the search committee for all their hard work throughout this search process. The School of Business benefits immensely from their commitment.

School of Public Health Dean Search

Regarding the search for the new Milken Institute School of Public Health, we have met with search firms and have identified a firm to manage the national search, which we aim to launch in the new year. The public health full-time faculty will work quickly to elect its members to serve on the dean search committee, at which point I will discuss with the committee which additional members representing other stakeholder groups (e.g., trustees, students, and alumni) should be invited to join as per the Faculty Code. Once the additional stakeholder representatives have been confirmed, I will charge the full committee, and we will formally launch the search.

I want to thank Dean Goldman for graciously agreeing to remain as dean until the new dean begins, ensuring a smooth transition of leadership.

Vice Provost for Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement Search

Regarding the search for a vice provost for diversity, equity and community engagement, we have chosen a search firm and are looking to launch this search in the new year.

Graduate Assistant Unionization

As you are aware, on November 12 and 13, eligible graduate teaching, instructional, and research assistants had an opportunity to participate in an election facilitated by the National Labor Relations Board. A majority of graduate assistants who voted in the election voted in favor of unionization.

GW is currently assembling a bargaining team to meet with the graduate student union, and we anticipate that bargaining will begin sometime during the spring semester. We will continue to work diligently with our graduate assistants to ensure that they have a meaningful and successful graduate experience at GW, and we look forward to their continued contributions to our scholarly community.

This concludes my report, and I am happy to answer any questions.



Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)

December 13, 2024

Ilana Feldman, Chair

FSEC Activities

FSEC met on November 22, arranging the agenda for today's Senate meeting and receiving updates on Senate committee activities. The President led an extensive discussion on the potential impacts on the university of the incoming US presidential administration. Adjacent to this discussion, FSEC agreed that it is important to keep the [Academic Freedom Portal](#) open on the Senate website for ongoing communication of any issues faculty may experience now or in the future.

The group discussed the nomination process for honorary degrees. The Provost confirmed that the [honorary degree nomination process and form](#) are available on the Provost office website. FSEC members were encouraged to relay this information to Senate members and their faculty colleagues.

Personnel Actions

There are no active grievances at the university.

Calendar

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is December 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, given that this meeting takes place one week from today. The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting is January 10, 2025.

All best wishes for a happy and healthy holiday season!

EPT Working Group Report in Response to Spring 2024 Encampment and Resulting Stet Agreements

December 13, 2024

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC



Working Group's Charge, Nature of Work and Findings

Context for
establishment
of WG

Information
Gathering

Summary of
Findings

EPT Working Group recommendations

- (1) GW leadership should support all university's students in pursuing their educational endeavors. It should *avoid seeking or agreeing to the removal of educational resources* from students in good standing, unless those students are determined to pose a threat to the university community.
- (2) GW leadership should use the interim suspension process in a politically neutral way and adjust such processes as quickly as possible.
- (3) Regarding the internal student conduct process, recommitting to principles:
 - With large files or videos concerning a case, CESA should mark the information relevant to the specific case.
 - CESA should not engage in collective punishment; individuals should be held responsible for their own actions.
 - CESA should respond in a timely manner, giving students adequate time to review the information that provides the substance of the charge against them.
- (4) In matters that impact instruction, including students' access to educational facilities on campus, we recommend that, in the future, GW leadership commit to increased transparency, communication, and consultation with its faculty.