



A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE *FACULTY CODE* (2) (19/3)

WHEREAS, A pending disciplinary review for a serious violation of a university policy may adversely affect a tenure candidate's request for tenure and such effect would be unfair if the candidate is ultimately cleared of the disciplinary charge. Article IV.A.3.1 should be amended to permit the Provost, with the candidate's consent, to extend the probationary period or to suspend an ongoing tenure review until the disciplinary process is complete.

WHEREAS, Findings of violations of university policy during a candidate's review may be a basis for a concurrence or non-concurrence; such findings should not be given retroactive effect, but may be considered in a future stage of the review process.

WHEREAS, The President's review of the Provost should incorporate the views of the university's constituents and involve an established process and timetable.

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

1. Article IV.A.3.1(b) should be amended to add:

5): The Provost, upon written notice to the candidate for tenure and with the candidate's consent, may extend the probationary period beyond the period set forth in paragraph c) below, or suspend an ongoing tenure review, pending the outcome of a university review of allegations of a serious violation of university policies (such as those on sexual and gender-based harassment and interpersonal violence, non-discrimination, prohibited relationships with students, research integrity, conflict of interest, misuse of university assets, and threats or acts of violence), of allegations of serious misconduct, or of criminal charges raised against a faculty member.

2. Article IV.E.1 should be amended to add:

iv.: A documented finding of a serious violation of university policies (such as those on sexual and gender-based harassment and interpersonal violence, non-discrimination, prohibited relationships with students, research integrity, conflict of interest, misuse of university assets, and threats or acts of violence), serious misconduct, or criminal violation. Such findings shall not be a basis to reconsider recommendations made at earlier stages of the review process, but rather will be considered at subsequent stages.

Proposed Changes to the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code

3. Section C.3 should be amended by adding the following after the existing text:

Continuance. The President shall meet with Provost annually to discuss the Provost's past performance and future goals. The President shall also periodically initiate a comprehensive review of the Provost that systematically solicits input from the university's constituents, including but not limited to faculty, vice presidents, vice provosts, Deans, trustees, alumni, staff, and students. A comprehensive review shall include the following steps:

- 1. The President shall discuss with the Provost, at the time of the Provost's appointment or reappointment, the criteria by which the President will review the Provost.*
- 2. The comprehensive review shall occur at least every three years.*
- 3. The process for comprehensive review shall be established by the President.*
- 4. The President shall provide to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee a summary of the general conclusion of the review with respect to the established criteria of the Provost's performance. The details of the final evaluation shall be conveyed only to the Provost, and the Board of Trustees.*

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
January 11, 2019

Adopted as amended by the Faculty Senate
January 11, 2019