



Faculty Senate

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SENATE MEETING HELD ON MAY 12, 2023 VIA WEBEX

Present: President Wrighton, Provost Bracey; Executive Committee Chair Feldman; Parliamentarian Binder; Acting Registrar Cloud; Senate Office Staff Liz Carlson and Jenna Chaojareon; Deans Ayres, Bass, Feuer, Goldman, Henry, Lach, Matthew, Mehrotra, Riddle, and Wahlbeck; Interim Dean Johnson; Professors Anenberg, Badie, Borum, Briggs, Brinkerhoff, Callier, Clarke, Eakle, El-Ghazawi, Engel, Griesshammer, Gupta, Gutman, Kargaltsev, Kay, Kieff, Lu, Marvar, Mazhari, Mylonas, Olesen, Orti, Parsons, Pittman, Rain, Schultheiss, Schwindt, Tielsch, von Barghahn, Vyas, Wagner, Wilson, Wirtz, and Zeman.

Absent: Deans Bass, Goldman, Matthew, and Riddle; Interim Dean Johnson; Professors Bamford, Cordes, Gore, Kulp, and Sarkar.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:01p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The [minutes](#) of the April 14, 2023, Faculty Senate meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SENATE MEMBERS BEGINNING TERMS (Mark Wrighton, President)

President Wrighton recognized the Senate members who began their terms of service on May 1:

- Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (CCAS): Oleg Kargaltsev, Don Parsons, & David Rain
- Elliott School of International Affairs (ESIA): Jennifer Brinkerhoff
- GW School of Business (GWSB): Yixin Lu
- Graduate School of Education & Human Development (GSEHD): Laura Engel
- School of Engineering & Applied Science (SEAS): Sameh Badie
- School of Medicine & Health Sciences (SMHS): Paul Marvar

ELECTION OF THE SENATE PARLIAMENTARIAN

Professor Sarah Binder's nomination as Senate Parliamentarian was approved by unanimous consent. Her term continues through the election of the Parliamentarian at the May 2024 meeting.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Mark Wrighton, President)

President Wrighton observed that this is his last Faculty Senate meeting as President, and he thanked the Senate and expressed his hope that Dr. Granberg would enjoy the same collaboration and collegiality that he has enjoyed during his time at GW. He noted that Dr. Granberg is coming up to speed very quickly ahead of her July 1 start date and has made several visits to campus. She has been meeting with university leaders and trustees and is off to an excellent start in terms of her education about the strengths and traditions of the university. President Wrighton noted he would have another meeting with her this weekend and would bring her up to date on a number of important issues.

The President noted that in the time remaining in his tenure, he is looking forward to attending many events at the end of the academic year, including several school and college celebrations, culminating with Commencement on the National Mall on Sunday, May 21. He looked forward to greeting many visitors on campus for these celebrations and expressed his hope that many Senate faculty and their colleagues will attend to show their support of GW's graduates.

He reflected on some recent events showcasing GW faculty's expertise and contributions to their fields and to society, including:

- a Business and Policy Forum led by the GWSB, in which he was able to moderate a discussion on cybersecurity with Senator Mark Warner;
- a meaningful retrospective event on the Vietnam War era organized by CCAS faculty and leadership; and
- an "only at GW" experience earlier this month of welcoming Vice President Harris and other administration officials to campus for the White House Forum on Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, & Pacific Islanders.

The President referenced the important update the Provost, CAO Paulsen, and he shared earlier this week about the COVID-19 vaccine mandate and university response. The university is now strongly recommending, but will not require, vaccination for all community members. The President thanked the Medical Advisory Group for their input and advice as this decision was reached. The university has done extraordinarily well both with key individuals in the medical and public health areas who have worked very hard and creatively on behalf of the entire community. He especially singled out the Milken Institute School of Public Health (GWSPH) and the School of Medicine & Health Sciences (SMHS) and their respective deans, Lynn Goldman and Barbara Bass. He hoped that all would remain mindful that a recurrence of severe infectious illness can occur again while enjoying this return to a period of relative good health.

Finally, President Wrighton noted late-breaking news from Athletics Director Tanya Vogel that the women's rowing team has won the A-10 championship, In addition, both the women's and men's swimming and diving teams won their respective A-10 championships this year.

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PRESIDENT'S REPORT

None.

RESOLUTION 24/1: Of Appreciation of President Mark Wrighton (Ilana Feldman, Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee)

Professor Feldman read the [attached resolution](#) into the record.

Provost Bracey made the following remarks:

“I would like to offer a few of my own words of appreciation for President Wrighton as he concludes his final Faculty Senate meeting, and soon, his tenure as President of the George Washington University. I made no secret of my genuine affection and admiration of President Wrighton. I have been very fortunate—as have many present today—to have enjoyed the support and mentorship of many distinguished individuals guiding my professional development. It wasn’t until the arrival of Mark Wrighton that I felt that I had someone close to me who could fill that critical mentorship void and help me advance to the next stage of personal and professional development.

“We have all been the beneficiaries of Mark’s remarkable leadership and ability to draw everyone in to achieve a common purpose or set of objectives. President Wrighton is exactly what GW needed to regain its swagger and mojo as a premier private university located in the heart of the nation’s capital. And he is exactly what I think we needed in terms seeing what legendary excellence in administrative leadership looks like in action. I have said this before, but the George Washington Community is extremely fortunate to have had a leader like Mark Wrighton at the helm.

“So I want to thank you, Mark, for making us all better versions of ourselves. We are a better university because of you. You have charted the course as we have embarked upon our third century, and we carry with us your vision, your energy, and your great sense of humor. You are now part of the DNA of this great university, and, while the GW presidency adds to the luster of your resume – MIT, Washington University in St. Louis, and now the George Washington University – it also leaves an indelible imprint on this university.

“Please join me in a round of applause for the 18th president of the George Washington University – Mark Steven Wrighton!”

President Wrighton noted that it has been a true pleasure to work with Provost Bracey, who has a sharp legal mind and a great command of the entire university as well as the significant scope of all that is taking place at GW. He noted that he looked forward to resuming his role as a professor at WashU and will be teaching a class in the fall on chemistry and energy and in the spring on financing higher education. He thanked the Senate for their kind words and stated he would treasure this resolution.

The resolution was adopted by unanimous consent.

RESOLUTION 24/2: To Approve Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity (Sarah Wagner, Co-Chair, Educational Policy & Technology Committee)

Professor Wagner introduced the [attached resolution](#), noting that the Code of Academic Integrity Review Subcommittee included three members of the Educational Policy & Technology (EPT)

committee. The subcommittee worked together beginning in early fall 2022 and deliberated over changes that might be necessary to the Code. Those changes were presented to EPT at its March 24 meeting. Following feedback from the committee and other stakeholders, the subcommittee returned to the April 21 EPT meeting; at that point, EPT deliberated and provided its unanimous approval of those changes. Professor Wagner recognized Aaron Howell, Assistant Director of the Student Rights & Responsibilities Office, to introduce the resolution via the [attached slides](#).

Professor Clarke noted that the Code change meant to address concerns around the use of ChatGPT and other AI software doesn't seem to adequately cover this issue. He noted that a circumstance where a student types a query into ChatGPT and obtains a response from the program could be argued, technically, to be work being prepared by the student. A parallel that would not be considered a Code violation would be a student entering an algorithm and data into a computer and obtaining a result, or a student using a resource such as Grammarly to proof their written work. He did not wish to offer updated language at the moment but urged the office to consider this issue at its next opportunity and more clearly spell out what is meant by "work not done by the student." Mr. Howell thanked Professor Clarke for this comment and noted this issue for clarification on the next round of Code revisions. He added that collaboration and the use of resources is very subjective by specific assignment, and he encouraged instructors to give clear expectations to students regarding what is "authorized."

Professor Wagner moved the adoption of the resolution by unanimous consent; the motion was seconded. No objections were registered, and the resolution was adopted.

MOTION FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION: Ilana Feldman, Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Professor Feldman rose to a question of privilege affecting the assembly and was recognized by President Wrighton. Professor Feldman moved that the Senate move into executive session for no more than an hour for a discussion of the role of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) in facilitating shared governance, inviting Professor Shaista Khilji to join the session as an invited guest given her role in negotiating the shared governance principles last year and confirming the attendance of President Wrighton (as presiding officer) and Provost Bracey (who chairs the Senate in the absence of the President). The motion was seconded by Professor Griesshammer. The Chair ruled that the question is one of privilege to be entertained immediately and opened the floor for debate on the motion.

Professor Gupta asked whether the executive session is related to Resolution 24/3, the arming of the GWPD, or both. Professor Feldman responded that her motion was occasioned by the numerous conversations that have arisen around both of these things. She added that the goal in requesting an executive session is to begin (but not conclude today) a broader conversation about FSEC's role in shared governance, including about the issue of confidentiality. Recognizing that FSEC is a body of the Senate and plays a role in the collective effort to obtain input from the full Senate and to help guide the charge to the Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) committee for the coming year as relates to these matters. Underlying all this is that the Senate is looking forward to a new president who will begin her term shortly, and these conversations represent part of an effort to try and make the Senate as effective as possible in its work with her. Speaking to the reason she was requesting an executive session in particular, she stated the aim is to create an opportunity for the whole membership of the Senate to engage in open conversations with

and for each other. Over the past few weeks, there has been a great deal of frustration and many hallway conversations. There are few mechanisms in place that allow the Senate to converse as a body without outside observers, and she expressed that it is vital, as the Senate prepares to welcome Dr. Granberg, that it is in the best possible shape internally as a body. She expressed her belief that the proposed conversation will help with this effort.

Professor Orti spoke against the motion, given that the topic revolves around shared governance and the role of transparency in improving shared governance. He stated that an executive session goes against transparency and seems counterproductive, as the wider community is then deprived of an understanding of the Senate's discussions and points of view, however controversial they may be. Professor Parsons concurred, noting that it seems odd to go into a closed session to discuss transparency.

Professor Clarke expressed his support for the motion. He stated that the objections stated thus far seem very abstract; whether one has a discussion about a particular issue in an executive session or not should be determined by the characteristics of a particular issue and can't be decided by general appeals to terms like "transparency." He added that there is a virtue to be found in discussing certain issues where the public is not listening in, and this may be one of those points. Ultimately, he stated, he saw no harm in an executive session discussion.

Professor Briggs spoke in favor of the motion. She noted that the intent is for the Senate to have an open and frank conversation among Senate members about how the Senate operates, including about how the Senate would like FSEC to operate. This is a reasonable topic to discuss among just the Senate membership and without additional attendees; ideally, the Senate can come to consensus and present a united front.

Professor Wagner noted that this very point is what is at the heart of the matter. While this is about transparency—something she takes very seriously—this is also about a discussion that is representative of the entire faculty assembly. The Senate should be able to sort through—in a public way—what the documents and procedures before it are and how the Senate understands, interprets, and operationalizes them. This, she stated, needs to be done openly, and the Senate shouldn't shy away from talking about this publicly as the conversation isn't just for the Senate but for all of the faculty it represents.

Professor Wilson spoke in favor of the motion. He noted that he has spoken with a number of his colleagues and is acutely aware of strong feelings on both sides of these issues. Given this, it is easy for media reporting on a discussion to unevenly represent these sides. He noted that he would like the Senate to be able to speak frankly with each other and, if possible, come to a consensus and then speak with one voice to the administration and the trustees.

Professor Wirtz spoke in favor of the motion, noting that the Senate has placed great faith in FSEC and that he continues to do so. If FSEC feels it is appropriate to go into an executive session, he would be bound by their guidance, and he stated his intent to vote for the motion.

Professor Orti requested a roll call vote. A vote on the motion to go into executive session passed 24-6, with 1 abstention. The results of the vote are as follows:

Aye	Nay	Abstain
Anenberg	Brinkerhoff	Marvar
Badie	Mylonas	
Briggs	Orti	
Callier	Parsons	
Clarke	Schultheiss	
Eakle	Wagner	
Engel		
Feldman		
Griesshammer		
Gupta		
Gutman		
Kargaltsev		
Kay		
Kieff		
Lu		
Mazhari		
Pittman		
Rain		
Tielsch		
von Barghahn		
Vyas		
Wilson		
Wirtz		
Zeman		

The Senate moved into executive session at 2:48pm. The open session resumed following the conclusion of the executive session at 3:51pm.

RESOLUTION 24/3: Clarifying Shared Governance and the Role of the Faculty Senate on the Occasion of a New President of the University (Guillermo Orti, Senate Member)

Professor Orti introduced the [attached resolution](#) with the following remarks:

“I assume that all senators are familiar with the Faculty Organization Plan (FOP) and its meaning as a foundational document that:

“enables the Faculty of The George Washington University, in keeping with sound principles of university organization, to perform effectively its functions and responsibilities with respect to educational policy and objectives of the University and related affairs in which the faculty has a legitimate concern or interest”

and also that, according to the FOP, we, the Faculty Senate, are the “*representative body acting for the Faculty as the whole in legislative and *advisory* capacities.*”

“It would be also good to remember that, according to the FOP, “the Faculty Assembly has authority to

“direct the [Faculty] Senate to...study and report back to the Assembly, or to take such other action as may be appropriate with respect to any matter of concern to the Assembly.” The Assembly also “receive[s] information from the President, and such members of the University administration as he may designate, of matters of general University interest of faculty concern.” It may also review actions taken by the Faculty Senate and “act as a referendum body on questions referred to it for that purpose by the [Faculty] Senate.” (FOP, Article II., Section 4.)

“The news, transmitted to the GW community by President Wrighton on April 13, stating that “the Board of Trustees has directed the university administration to develop an implementation plan for arming GWPD officers” has not been well received by the GW community, to say the least. Students marched to the GW president’s house in protest, several editorials against this decision were published in the Hatchet, most student organizations manifested their opposition, more than 400 students signed a petition against this action, and more than 200 faculty also signed their own petition urging the Board of Trustees to reverse the GWPD arming decision--and a small representative group of the faculty letter signatories met with the president a few days ago to express their concern.

“The President's letter to the university stated, "After more than a year of careful consideration and deliberation, review of safety data and best practices, and input from experts"; however, at the meeting when the faculty signatories met with the President to present our own views and data/studies and asked what data the Board used, the President said there were "no relevant data or studies drawn on by the board." So, this issue seems to go beyond transparency.

“Furthermore, the process by which this decision was made is not consistent with principles of shared governance agreed upon by the faculty, the administration, and the Board as expressed in resolution 22/13 that recommends, among other things:

“that future discussions of shared governance appreciate the vital importance of Senate committees, where faculty and staff collaboratively bring their expertise to bear in policymaking and problem solving, and that providing these committees with meaningful opportunities to participate in policymaking and strategic planning in their respective areas, as mandated by the FOP, is essential for the success of our mission as a university.”

“Resolution 22/13 and its attached “Statement of Principles of Shared Governance and Recommended Mechanisms to Strengthen Shared Governance at the George Washington University” highlights the notion that “regular faculty participate in the formulation of policy and planning decisions affecting the quality of education and life at the University.”

“Thinking back to the Faculty Assembly’s role assigned by the FOP, it would be wise to consider that ~200+ faculty (who are members of the Assembly) could indeed direct the Senate to do just what this resolution is asking for (especially considering recent Faculty Assembly attendance numbers). Such action may even take place at the first Assembly for the new president, in Fall 2023.

“The Statement of Principles also talks about transparency:

“We are committed to transparency in institutional decision-making and managing the university. We encourage an environment that allows for free exchange of ideas and candid discourse for everyone on campus and those serving on institutional governance bodies and committees. At the same time, we recognize that there may be legal or business reasons why certain information may not be shared, for example, on personnel matters or competitively sensitive issues, and as referenced earlier, that governance is not management.”

“We have heard many times the term “sensitive information” to request confidentiality, and it would be important to define this term beyond the exceptions noted above (personnel, legal, or business reasons). Arming the police does not seem to fall into either category.¹

“We have also heard the term “sounding board” as a commonly accepted function for FSEC that is not mentioned in the FOP. In fact, this function seems to be recognized by many as important or even vital and is used to justify reception of confidential information by the administration.

“Indeed, in a statement recently circulated by FSEC to Senators, this sentiment is quite strongly emphasized:

“If FSEC is uncertain whether it can receive confidential information or information that is potentially confidential, the Board and Administration may decide to not share it, thus effectively cutting out the Senate from early-stage deliberations. That will reduce the opportunity to influence the discussion in early stages of the decision-making process.”

“As witnessed by the case of arming the police and the confidentiality agreement between FSEC and the President back in February, this hypothesis of “influencing early stages of the decision-making process” did not go well.

“Interestingly, the 2022 New Senator Orientation Document, diligently prepared and posted by Jenna, Liz, and the Parliamentarian, on the Senate website lists among FSEC functions:

“Receives updates from the President and Provost, provides counsel”

“The 2023 version (now posted online) has been amended, and the “provides counsel” piece has been (appropriately, I believe) removed. I acknowledge this amendment and commend the team for the update!

“Instead, we see listed among key FSEC functions (and I quote):

“Helps to implement shared governance: Facilitates flow of information between the administration, the Board, the Faculty Senate, and Senate committees, and reports regularly to the full Senate.”

“There is no mention of confidentiality or keeping secret information or providing advice as functions of FSEC. The principle of transparency, in contrast, is strongly advocated in our shared governance documents.

¹ Here, Professor Orti referenced Whereas clauses 3 and 4 of Resolution 24/3.

“This is what this resolution is about. We need to have a solid agreement to what our functions are as senators and in particular as FSEC members to participate actively in shared governance.

“I would argue that transparency is important because:

- It is the bedrock of shared governance and *good* governance;
- It is a commitment that trustees, admin, and the faculty have made via Shared Governance principles; and
- Our recent history indicates that when transparency is lacking, GW climate sours.

“In specific terms for the case of arming the GWPD, lack of transparency:

- Led to a decision that was not supported by evidence or data; and
- This decision is likely to lead to resistance to its implementation

“If we need to change the FOP, we (PEAF) will certainly engage in such an exercise going forward. But the guidance we have now and until any changes may become the new law of the land does not provide for any retention of confidential information by FSEC.”

Professor Orti moved consideration of the resolution; Professor Wagner seconded the motion.

Professor Wilson noted that both the FOP and the shared governance principles document were approved by the trustees and by the Senate. If the FOP were perfect, he stated, there would have been no need for the shared governance principles to be stated. As such, he regarded the shared governance principles document as, in a sense, modifying the FOP and hoped that PEAF could identify a way to amend the FOP to incorporate these principles. Professor Orti responded that the shared governance principles document states that it is consistent with the roles and responsibilities of all the governing bodies concerned as reflected in the university’s governing documents. It includes recommended mechanisms to strengthen shared governance at GW and does not alter or amend the governing documents. The university’s current governing documents are the law of the land and dictate expected behavior. The current problem is that processes have not been following the FOP; for example, there has been a perception that FSEC could hold confidential hearings and provide counsel, which is not what the FOP states. This has led to the shared governance process being ineffective; this is what the resolution is trying to address. He regarded the two documents as complementing each other.

Professor Wirtz underscored a critical component of Professor Wilson’s point. What the Senate is currently dealing with is the question of whether the FOP as it currently stands does an adequate job of defining the roles and responsibilities of FSEC. He referenced Professor Orti’s point that the FOP is the “law of land,” but, as Professor Wilson noted, that law is perhaps not doing an adequate job of promoting the full set of principles the Senate would like to promote. He stated that the question of confidentiality is a tricky one, and no document may ever be able to legislate that. However, it is clear that the Senate would not have needed the shared governance document if the FOP had adequately addressed what the present-era Senate thinks needs to be done. As a result, the present conversation has necessarily turned to the adequacy of the FOP. At this point, Professor Wirtz suggested, the Senate is not in a position to do anything more than raise that as a reasonable question. Recognizing that the current resolution arrived on the Senate floor in a perfectly legitimate way, he noted that when a resolution raises this many important questions, it is ordinarily sent to the relevant Senate committee for study and recommendations. Professor Wirtz stated that he did not want to stifle debate on this important topic but alerted the Chair that he planned to make a motion

following debate to commit the resolution to PEAFF so that the committee might undertake a thorough vetting of this question through broader input and study, determining whether the FOP should be modified (or if something else needs to happen) and then return to the Senate after the issue has had the benefit of the wider community's input.

Professor Orti responded that the FOP is not the problem; rather, the problem is that procedures are not following the FOP. As evidence of this, he pointed again to the 2022 New Senator Orientation slides, which include under FSEC's responsibilities the phrase "provides counsel," which is not stated in the FOP. He stated that PEAFF can certainly consider amendments to the FOP in the future, but, at this time, the current version of the FOP needs to be followed.

Professor Eakle noted that it seems the FOP contains several points on what FSEC and the Senate "shall do" but does not say, for example, that FSEC "shall not" serve as consulting body (whether in confidence or not). He understood consultations to include making recommendations to the administration about the appropriate Senate committee to consult on a given issue. The resolution seems to restrict FSEC's consultative abilities that are actually valuable for shared governance. He noted that he would support a motion to commit the resolution to PEAFF.

Professor Wagner spoke in support of the resolution. She stated that she did so cognizant of the enormous amount of frustration and agitation over the process around the recent decision to arm the GWPD. The current resolution clarifies how to proceed until such future point that amendments might take place. The resolution sets out rules of guidance to address concerns from faculty colleagues who are frustrated with the decision to arm the GWPD. She also noted that the shared governance document was in part due to faculty frustration but also due to Board skepticism, wariness, or outright frustration with the faculty over their modes of expressing displeasure with the previous administration. The shared governance principles document therefore has a more complex history than has been described today. It provides a road map for the Board, the administration, and the faculty, but it exists because a lot of things didn't go as planned, including from the perspective of the Board. She stated her support for the resolution, seeing it as a step forward until there is a point at which the Senate might wish to clarify the FOP.

Professor Feldman noted that the resolution seeks to address the faculty dissatisfaction around the Board's decision to arm the GWPD and the Board's process in reaching that decision; this dissatisfaction is shared by many. However, the resolution does not address this as the Board did not seek faculty consultation in making this decision. While this resolution seeks to state and inform certain practices, it does not speak to the process by which the decision was made or the decision itself. However, the conversation emerging as a result of the decision points to the need for a much more extensive reflection on the role of FSEC as a body of the Senate and how it can best support shared governance and Senate operations in general, and she encouraged this reflection.

Professor Briggs agreed that the current resolution does not speak to the dissatisfaction that its signatories and other members of the faculty and student body have with the plan to arm GWPD. Instead, it addresses FSEC as the problem. While she felt FSEC is not completely without blame in the process, she noted that this decision was made without FSEC knowledge in the beginning of that process. FSEC was not consulted until the decision had been made, at which point discussions were limited to implementation only. While she agreed that the issue has brought forth a necessary and important conversation about shared governance and FSEC's role in it, the resolution does not address the displeasure she senses the faculty wishes to convey over that decision and the process by

which it was made. The Board's decision was not reflective of the shared governance principles the faculty thought were in place. Shared governance is a process, and the university is at the very beginning of that. Some positive changes have taken place as a result of the shared governance document, but, she noted, it would serve the Senate well to begin a broader discussion and develop more principles that can be documented in the FOP on what—within the shared governance framework—the faculty would like FSEC to do for them.

Professor Orti referenced the resolution's final whereas clause, which states that FSEC has exceeded its authority by holding confidential deliberations with the administration in the case of learning in February that the Board intended to arm the GWPD. This issue is therefore germane to the discomfort of the faculty with the decision and their discomfort with the process and not following an ethical process, which is facilitating the flow of information to the committees and making the issue public in order to generate a productive discussion, which would in turn lead to a more informed decision. He reiterated his view that FSEC needs to be strict about following the current FOP and avoiding these problems in the future.

Professor Zeman noted that the shared governance principles document, while repeatedly stating its consistency with other governing docs, is in reality not consistent. As an example, he pointed out that the FOP does not provide for the joint meetings of FSEC and the Board executive committee that now take place with each board cycle as a result of the shared governance principles process. He noted that this would be an optimal time to address modernizing FSEC's role, taking into account frustrations held on both sides of the issue.

Professor Wagner noted that there was no opportunity to query the Board's decision immediately upon FSEC's being made aware of it. She noted that, had she had the opportunity to listen to powerful, well-informed, demonstrably factual evidence that this decision would be a good thing for the campus, she might feel differently. However, that opportunity was not afforded to her or any other Senate member outside of FSEC; this represents a breakdown. She invited the group to consider whether the stance that this decision was a done deal and there was nothing to be done is an honest assessment of the faculty's expectations in that moment and imagined that the Senate can do better.

Professor Wirtz noted that the present discussion reinforces in his mind the disagreements among Senate members about exactly what the FOP says and what FSEC is empowered to do. These are not issues that will be resolved on the spot by the membership present. Professor Wirtz moved to commit the resolution to PEAFF with the specific stipulation that they review all GW's governing documents as well as the 2021 shared governance principles agreement and return to the Senate with a recommendation of whether (and, if so, how) the FOP or other documents should be modified to meet the contemporary needs of the faculty in the university community. Professor Eakle seconded the motion. The Parliamentarian noted that the motion is debatable and amendable.

President Wrighton, having to depart the meeting for travel, again thanked the Senate for the appreciate resolution they bestowed on him earlier in the meeting. He expressed his sorrow that the Board's decision has created such division and noted that the many discussions he has had since about the decision as well as the process by which it was reached have been helpful. He pledged to sustain the ongoing efforts to build good relations between the administration and the faculty and to work to enhance the Board's relationship with the faculty as well. He stressed that the trustees are frankly admiring of the faculty and are deeply appreciative of all the education and scholarly work

they do. Based upon his long experience in academia, he noted that a university is its faculty and its students, with a great deal of support from a talented staff. Upon President Wrighton's departure, Provost Bracey assumed the chairship of the meeting.

Professor Gupta stated his support for the motion, noting that the full PEAf committee is well situated to do a good job of obtaining information from the university community and bringing it back to the Senate at the appropriate time. As an aside, he noted that Johns Hopkins had voted on and approved the arming of their police force and is now seeing demonstrations against the decision there; it is not unusual for students and staff to protest and attempt to reverse controversial decisions.

Professor Griesshammer requested and obtained unanimous consent for the statements shared with the Senate from FSEC earlier this week ([one from the outgoing FSEC](#) and [one from the incoming FSEC](#)) to be posted with these minutes.

Professor Griesshammer identified himself as an FSEC member who was at the meetings in question. He noted that he wanted to reflect personally, not speaking for FSEC. In thinking about what FSEC could have done better in this situation, he noted that FSEC could have reached out to the chairs of relevant standing committees as has happened in other issues (e.g., in discussions about the MFA). He affirmed that FSEC does not understand itself as a body that gives feedback on behalf of the faculty or as a body that has the necessary expertise to provide advice to the administration. He spoke against the motion to commit, stating that he believes the resolution is fundamentally flawed and should be voted down. He agreed that an open process within PEAf is required, as Professor Wirtz has outlined, but that, in its current form, the resolution sends the wrong signal and provides a flawed template for starting this process in many respects.

For instance, he stated, Professor Orti is correct that the resolution speaks to the dissatisfaction of the faculty; the last whereas clause clearly puts FSEC on the spot as exceeding its authority to hold confidential deliberations. However, he noted that this clause is factually incorrect: FSEC has not had deliberations about the decision but was rather informed of the decision (as the statement from the outgoing FSEC clearly states). Actually, the outgoing FSEC statement explicitly states that "at no point did either FSEC or the President imply that informing FSEC about the Board's decision would replace or preclude consultation with the Senate and the faculty". He noted Professor Wagner's comment that powerful arguments were presented to FSEC for the decision and stressed that no such arguments were presented. There was a back and forth, but everyone in the meeting understood that this was not replacing a consultative process of the faculty.

In addition, he noted, FSEC did not receive more information than what was provided to the Senate. In fact, he thought, it is possible that FSEC may have received less information than the full Senate as the FSEC discussion may have led the administration to add to its communication on the issue. He had as many questions about the data and rationale for the decision as the next person. He stated that the resolution therefore tries to scapegoat the outgoing FSEC over something that the community (including himself) feels very deeply about and puts the incoming FSEC on notice. However, this is a misdirection of the dissatisfaction the community is feeling. Finally, the resolution's last resolving clause provides what H.L. Mencken nicely summarized when he wrote: "There is always a well-known solution to every human problem – neat, plausible and wrong."

He expressed a preference to give PEAFF a fresh charge along the lines of what Professor Wirtz described in his motion; such a process would yield recommendations that apply to FSEC as well as other committees that receive confidential information.

Professor Orti expressed his sense that, in September, the Senate will be busy with other business. FSEC's role can be clarified in this moment by approving this resolution and moving ahead with a level playing field so that everyone understands that the FOP needs to be followed. The resolution clears the road ahead and makes shared governance easy to implement and understand by straightforwardly defining the roles everyone should be playing. He expressed his opposition to the motion, adding that he would be happy, as a member of PEAFF, to look at whether improvements might be made to the governing documents in the future. However, the documents as they exist now should be guiding procedures until such time as amendments are made.

Professor Schultheiss expressed her opposition to the motion, seeing no downside to passing the current resolution now. The resolution does not preclude the deeper discussion for which many today have voiced their support.

Professor Wirtz noted that his intention was not to table the resolution, as that would mean this specific resolution would need to return to the Senate. His motion to commit does not require that PEAFF return this resolution but would instead allow the committee to do a full survey of the issue and bring back either this resolution, a modified version of this resolution, or an entirely new resolution. The Parliamentarian confirmed that the committee receiving the resolution has the flexibility to do their work and send back a new resolution. Professor Griesshammer noted that this clarification eliminated his objection to committing the resolution.

Professor Briggs spoke in support of the motion, noting that allowing the full PEAFF committee to study and discuss these issues in a broader sense is a more constructive path and will yield a better outcome.

Professor Orti proposed an amendment to the motion to commit that would require PEAFF to return its recommendations to a special Senate meeting in June, a month from the present meeting. Professor Mylonas seconded the amendment.

Professor Wirtz spoke against the amendment, noting that the intent of his motion is to allow the committee and the Senate to take the time necessary to gather the documents and look at everything with due diligence in order to put something together that guides the Senate forward. Putting a time constraint of a month on this, particularly at this time of year, seems futile and does not get to the objective of doing the right thing by this issue. Professors Gupta and Zeman agreed with this point; Professor Zeman added that hearing people's frustrations around the issue should be part of the process, and this should not be subject to a time constraint.

A vote on the amendment to the motion to commit failed, 25-3.

A vote on the motion to commit the resolution to PEAFF passed, 21-8.

REPORT: Joint Report on Classroom Recordings/Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies, Educational Policy & Technology, and Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committees (Sarah Wagner, Co-Chair, Educational Policy & Technology Committee)

Referencing the [attached slides](#), Professor Wagner presented the [joint report on classroom recordings](#) that was distributed with the agenda for today's meeting. The report comes jointly from the co-chairs of the Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies (ASPP), EPT, and PEAFC committees as well as from Professor Schultheiss, who is the chair of the EPT subcommittee on classroom recordings and has done the lion's share of the work in compiling this report.

In presenting the report and the guidance from the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Professor Wagner made clear that Vice Provost Hammond wanted to underscore that this guidance about when recordings may be reviewed is not about a fishing expedition in which administrators are sifting through recordings looking for issues. However, the guidance still feels a bit problematic as there isn't a clear articulation of or policy on when one can review and what consent or informing takes place.

Professor Gupta noted that ASPP discussed this issue at each of its meetings this year. He noted that an issue of primary importance is whether the administration can, at any time they feel like it, review the recordings of a full-time regular faculty member (recognizing that the collective bargaining agreement governs part-time faculty). In discussions, Vice Provost Hammond reassured the committee that this would not be done randomly or without a good reason. Professor Gupta noted, however, that this could change with personnel changes, and that the committee strongly preferred the administration not have unfettered power to review classroom recordings. He noted that for classes meeting in person, Vice Provost Hammond stated that reviews should be done by faculty who visit a class in person—in other words, not simply reviewing a recording when an in-person class visit is possible. For classes meeting solely online, Vice Provost Hammond noted that recordings may be viewed by administrators but, importantly, only after informing or obtaining permission from the faculty member.

Professor Tielsch thanked the three committees for the incredible amount of work done on an issue that has been confusing for many faculty members. He asked for a definition of “statutory authority” as referenced in recommendation 2b. Professor Schultheiss responded that this suggested term was intended to mean that, should there be a lawsuit (in whatever jurisdiction) where recordings are subpoenaed, access can be given without faculty permission. Provost Bracey noted that “court ordered” would be a more appropriate term for this definition.

Professor Wilson asked whether court order authority would apply to recommendation 2c as well and how, if faculty have the authority to delete recordings from university servers and have done so before a court order happens but retained a recording in the cloud or on a hard drive, if they are still subject to court orders. Professor Wagner responded that recommendation 2c refers to the possibility of an overriding need for the administration to review a recording and allows faculty to deny that request without reprisal. Professor Schultheiss added that it is understood there are instances, such as a lawsuit, where faculty would not have the right to refuse to provide recordings. In all other instances, however, the subcommittee's recommendation is that permission must be sought in advance and that a faculty member denying access doesn't mean the faculty is admitting guilt on any particular matter.

Professor Schultheiss noted the inherent confusion around the distinction between the recordings that are done with university software and stored on university servers (and therefore apparently owned by the university) while the faculty retain the intellectual property rights to the content. Some kind of legal distinction needs to be made between the software/hardware and the intellectual content and that, somehow, because the intellectual content is held on university resources, the two issues become mixed up and indistinguishable. Because of this confusion, the subcommittee felt that recommending that permission must be granted would eliminate the need to sort out the question of when the content becomes part of the software. She noted that, no matter how many analogies committee members attempted, the issue still remained murky. The final recommendation was therefore that, in any instance outside of a lawsuit requiring the material, permission must be granted. Professor Clarke suggested the analogy of owning a physical book but not the work product contained in the book. The author of the content can produce that content in another form, but even the author can't repossess the physical book from its owner. Professor Schultheiss noted that authors might sign away rights in publishing agreements, so the analogy isn't exact. Professor Clarke observed that this would mean that the university would not be able to stop the faculty member from taking content elsewhere and repackaging or selling it; they simply own the file.

Professor Eakle appreciated the work that went into this report. He expressed a concern about unauthorized use of recordings with regard to editing and the increased prevalence of AI software that allows this. He asked whether there are guidelines for managing mischief around malicious editing that attempts to misrepresent the content of a recording. Professor Schultheiss responded that the survey leading to these recommendations was conducted before AI issues arose in a big way but that respondents were concerned about comments being isolated, taken out of context, and posted online in an effort to get a faculty member in trouble. While the committee did not address this specific issue, she noted that this type of editing—blatantly falsifying content—would break many more rules than these recommendations are considering. Professor Eakle added that this might be a topic worthy of discussion as technology may present issues that don't yet exist but are verging on possible (e.g., manipulated videos of politicians that appear very believable).

Professor Wagner expected that any upcoming revisions to the Code of Student Conduct may well address these types of issues. She stated that the present era requires responsiveness to these potential obstacles and uncertain situations. She hoped that the administration would follow the recommendations presented today and added that faculty should be able to record or not in a straightforward way—making the right decision for their particular class—and to be aware of the ramifications of that choice.

Professor Wagner expressed her hope that guidance on this might be ready for release by mid- or late-July instead of immediately prior to the start of the fall semester. Provost Bracey agreed that this sounded realistic but noted that this would need to be addressed with the new President upon her arrival.

Professor Wirtz recalled a medical school faculty member stating it was important, as part of her program, to have recordings available for a certain number of years because students going through the program need to be able to access first-year recordings later in the program. He recalled her arguing that recordings should be available to a program even after a faculty member leaves the university. He asked whether the committee's recommendations speak to this. Professor Schultheiss responded that this was not something that was discussed by the committees. This issue is important, she noted, but goes to the question of the degree to which a faculty member controls

recordings as opposed to someone else controlling them. If a faculty member controls their recordings, they can determine how they are handled upon their departure from the university.

Professor Parsons asked for confirmation that recordings are not required, noting that many classrooms have extremely inadequate recording capabilities. Should recordings be required at any point, the university needs to think about the equipment it places in classrooms for this purpose. The Provost responded that Dean Henry's team has now done a review of the equipment put into place—often in great haste—over the pandemic. This review identified many local-level purchases that would not have been made if the equipment decisions were being made centrally; GWIT is working on correcting these circumstances.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No new resolutions were introduced at the meeting.

Professor Griesshammer requested and was granted a point of privilege; he made the following statement:

“I hereby resign my position as CCAS Representative on FSEC, effective today, 12 May 2023, at the upcoming midnight. Concurrently, I resign from the Faculty Senate and its Committees as well as all university-wide committees I serve on, in whichever capacity.

“I feel that at times, my position and actions both within FSEC and outside have for some become a distraction in itself. I think I have been acting in good faith, and I realise that I do actually care what others think about me. I also see that I cannot devote as much time and energy as seems needed to fulfil my tasks as CCAS Representative on FSEC, in addition to my involvement in Committee work and my teaching and research obligations. Right now, my teaching, my students and my research portfolio suffer most from my other commitments -- and most importantly, my private life does.

“I see myself as a passionate centrist who wants to explore common ground and understand different views on complex subjects. I had hoped to steer a pragmatic approach to university governance, being both engaged for faculty and understanding of conflicting interests. I believe in Rules and Procedures as guardrails of power. I also believe in flexibility and pragmatism. I believe there is good will on all sides involved in Shared Governance: faculty, the administration, and the Board of Trustees. I believe in the fallibility of people despite their best intentions. I do not believe in blaming "the other side" when there is blame to go around.

“The issue of confidentiality is of fundamental importance in Shared Governance to both me and the CCAS Senators, with a wide range of views. I cannot in good faith represent a point of view which runs against my conscience because I feel it is not in the best interest of faculty and GW as a whole. Nonetheless, CCAS should be represented by someone whose opinions, choices and actions are not constantly scrutinised, but have instead a basic level of confidence by at least the CCAS Senators, if not by CCAS. In that context, it is not so relevant whether a majority or significant minority of them disagrees with my opinions, choices and actions. A CCAS Representative to FSEC should be a person who CCAS Senators overwhelmingly agree does in good faith represent as diverse a voice of the CCAS Senators as possible. My resignation is a natural consequence of my realisation that on some positions which are of fundamental import for both me and many colleagues, I am not that person.

“Being also one of just a few roll-overs from the "old" FSEC, my resignation might hopefully in addition serve as another signal that this is a new FSEC which should not be held accountable for the failures, actions or inactions of its predecessors.

“I think it is wise to make a clean break, leave the arena altogether and not continue in GW-wide Committees. This way, Committee work will not be tainted by my resignation from FSEC, and people will not judge my opinions in the light of it. This will allow CCAS to elect another Senator and populate Committees as it sees fit. As a consequence, I will also withhold, as much as I am able to, any comments or well-meant advice as unelected faculty member.

“It would be hyperbole to say that I "thoroughly enjoyed" being a Senator and representing CCAS in FSEC, but I will not pretend that it was only an onerous task. It was enormously rewarding. If others find that I may have helped a bit more than I hindered, that is all I can wish for.

“My resignation is not a statement about agreement or disagreement with certain decisions FSEC or the Faculty Senate has made. It is my decision, and my decision alone.

“As a last favour, I ask that FSEC convene soon, if possible this weekend, to select a temporary replacement (FOP III.5.b, last sentences before the enumeration). CCAS deserves full representation at Friday's FSEC meeting with the BoT Executive Committee, as it does in the other heavy work of the Summer term, like non-concurrences etc. I am confident that FSEC will consult with CCAS Senators. CCAS has no shortage of Senators who can do the job better than I.”

GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Senate Standing Committee Reports
Annual reports from the following committees have been received and have been posted to the Senate website:
 - [Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom](#)
 - [Research](#)
- II. Approval of the 2023-2024 Senate Calendar
The [attached calendar](#) was approved by unanimous consent and has been posted to the Senate website.
- III. Approval of 2023-2024 Senate Standing Committee Chairs & Rosters
The co-chairs of the Physical Facilities committee asked to add Professors Eli McCarthy & Mark Reeves as voting members. These appointments and the [attached standing committee rosters](#) were approved by unanimous consent. The committees' terms begin immediately and remain in force until the May 2024 meeting.
- IV. Approval of 2023-2024 University Administrative Committee Faculty Representatives
The [attached university administrative committee faculty appointments](#) were approved by unanimous consent.

V. Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Ilana Feldman, Chair
Professor Feldman's report is [attached](#).

VI. Provost's Remarks

The Provost's remarks are [attached](#). He added a personal comment to Professor Griesshammer, noting that it has been a pleasure working with him both inside and outside the Senate. He looked forward to maintaining a connection with him and to drawing on his wisdom and experience at GW.

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:44pm.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Faculty Senate

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Educational Policy & Technology Committee
April 25, 2023

Adopted by the Faculty Senate
May 12, 2023

Appendix A

Code of Academic Integrity

Preamble

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

Article I: The Authority of the Code of Academic Integrity

Section 1: Application of the Code of Academic Integrity

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

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

Section 2: Precedence of the Code of Academic Integrity

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

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

Section 3: Interpretation

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

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

Article II: Basic Considerations

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

Section 1: Definition of Academic Integrity Violations

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

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

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

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

1) Cheating: Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise; engaging in unauthorized collaboration in any academic exercise; submitting work for an in-class examination that has been prepared in advance without authorization; copying from another student's examination; representing material ~~prepared by another as one's own work~~ not prepared by the student as one's own work (including contract or paid cheating); violating rules governing administration of examinations; violating any rules relating to the academic integrity of a course or program.

2) Fabrication: Falsifying any data, information, or citation in an academic exercise.

3) Plagiarism: Misrepresenting words, ideas, or a sequence of ideas as original or one's own. Plagiarism can include failure to attribute, improper paraphrase, intentional plagiarism, and/or self-plagiarism as described below:

- **Failure to attribute:** Use and/or representation of another's words, ideas, sequence of ideas, data, and/or other work material without the necessary in-text attribution to credit the original author of those materials. In-text attributions include, but are not limited to, parenthetical citations, footnotes, or other notations that attribute academic material to the original source.
- **Improper paraphrase:** Use of direct language, including phrases or full sentences, from source material without including quotation marks; the lack of quotation marks misrepresents those words as belonging to the writer, even when an in-text citation or equivalent is given. If the writer's text echoes the word choice of the source material and that echoed word choice is not in quotation marks, the result is likely improper paraphrasing, even if an in-text citation is included. Proper paraphrasing requires source material to be restated in the words of the writer and attributed to the original author via an in-text citation or equivalent.
- **Intentional plagiarism:** Deliberately or knowingly using and representing ~~another person's~~ words, ideas, sequence of ideas, data, and/or other work material without proper acknowledgment, citation, or attribution. Material does not need to be copied verbatim to constitute intentional plagiarism. ~~Contract or paid cheating may constitute intentional plagiarism.~~
- **Self-plagiarism:** Submission of work ~~previously submitted~~ previously submitted for credit, in whole or in part as if the new submission is original work, or the concurrent submission of material to more than one course. Such submission is prohibited unless the instructor of record explicitly permits it on a given assignment.

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

Section 2: Reporting violations

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

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

Section 3: Assignments and Examinations

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

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

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

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

Article III: The University Integrity and Conduct Council

Section 1: Mission of the University Integrity and Conduct Council

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

academic integrity and for administering all procedures in this Code.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 3: Selection and Removal of UICC Members

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

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

subject to the Code or a designee; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 4: Case Procedures

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

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

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

be initiated as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

not invalidate the proceedings.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 5: Sanctions

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

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

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

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

g)

—

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

h)

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

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

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

Section 6: Appeals

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

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

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

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

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

(e)

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

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

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

Section 1: Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity

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

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

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

(c)

Appendix B

Code of Academic Integrity

Preamble

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

Article I: The Authority of the Code of Academic Integrity

Section 1: Application of the Code of Academic Integrity

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

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

Section 2: Precedence of the Code of Academic Integrity

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

Section 3: Interpretation

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

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

Article II: Basic Considerations

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

Section 1: Definition of Academic Integrity Violations

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 2: Reporting violations

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

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

Section 3: Assignments and Examinations

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

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

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

Article III: The University Integrity and Conduct Council

Section 1: Mission of the University Integrity and Conduct Council

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

academic integrity and for administering all procedures in this Code.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 3: Selection and Removal of UICC Members

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

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

subject to the Code or a designee; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 4: Case Procedures

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

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

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

be initiated as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 5: Sanctions

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

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

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

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

Section 6: Appeals

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

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

Section 1: Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity

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

May 9, 2023

To: Office of the Faculty Senate

Fr: Aaron Howell, Assistant Director of SRR on behalf of the Code Review Committee

Re: Proposed changes/Topics of discussion: Code of Academic Integrity

Below are proposed significant changes to the Code of Academic Integrity. Redline and clean versions of the proposed revisions are attached to garner feedback.

Proposed Substantive Changes:

- Adding a Warning process similar to the Code of Student Conduct to demonstrate the University's commitment to restorative principles with the hope to increase the number of incident reports submitted to SRR.
 - RATIONALE: Not only is this in an effort to be more restorative to students, this is also in hopes the process becomes more accessible for reporting instructors. Additionally, some reporting instructors have shared concerns of hesitation in bringing an allegation forward either because it was not "serious enough" or because bringing a report forward could have the potential to alter a student's life.
- Adding a specific carveout for students in a Pre-College Program in Section 1 – to whom the Code applies.
 - RATIONALE: Pre-College Programs have a duration of roughly two weeks at a time. Given this, having their own procedures would allow for a more expedient outcome for students who allegedly commit a violation. This change is also being added to the Code of Student Conduct.
- Including substantive procedural guidance for Academic Integrity Panels and rights that will be offered to respondents going through an Academic Integrity Panel.
 - RATIONALE: Clarify what rights and responsibilities the responding students are offered through the hearing process as well as offer guidance for Presiding Officers in an Academic Integrity Panel and staff members in Student Rights & Responsibilities.
- Clarifying the expectation regarding a reporting instructor's duty to initially meet with a student they suspect of academic dishonesty. The proposed changes include changing, "however reported, the instructor of record *will* present the student with specific allegations..." to "however, reported the instructor of record *is encouraged to* present the student with specific allegations..."
 - RATIONALE: Spelling what is required for instructors at the beginning stages of the process and avoiding any perceptions of stated procedures outlined in the Code. Additionally matching current practice as SRR conveys this initial meeting to be highly encouraged, but not required for reporting instructors.
- Mirroring language found in the Code of Student Conduct regarding record retention in SRR. This is to ensure consistency across different case types.
 - RATIONALE: To prevent a situation where a responding student is ineligible to have their record administratively archived and to demonstrate our commitment to restoration. As found in the Code of Student Conduct, a length of time has been added as a criterion in addition to graduation to be eligible for having a record administratively archived when certain outcomes are administered as a result when a student is found responsible.
- Adding a definition of the word "graduation" since record retention is tied to certain outcomes that are administered when a student is found responsible.

- RATIONALE: Similar to the point above, to prevent a situation where a responding student is ineligible to have their record administratively archived and to demonstrate our commitment to restoration. Currently, there is not clear guidance on what “graduation” means, and if a student were to transfer from GW, this could provide a pathway for those students to still have their record administratively archived if they complete their degree requirements at another institution.

Proposed Non-Substantive Changes:

- Removing Contract or paid cheating from the definition of Intentional Plagiarism as that would fall under the scope of the Cheating definition.
 - RATIONALE: Prevent any confusion of what alleged violation would be applicable where a student contracts or pays to have their work completed on their behalf.
- Rewording some of the language in the definitions of Cheating and Plagiarism that reference “another” or “another person” to ensure that resources that generate material or other artificial intelligence services are encompassed by the given definition.
 - RATIONALE: Responding to the insurgence of ChatGPT and other artificial intelligence services that will generate content on their own and ensuring that when students potentially misuse these resources, there would be possible recourse under the Code of Academic Integrity.
- Changing “Sanction Violation” to “Outcome Violation” to mirror the Code of Student Conduct.
 - RATIONALE: Consistency in language across both the Code of Student Conduct and the Code of Academic Integrity.
- Revising for readability, grammar and formatting changes, and consistency between language found in the Code of Student Conduct and SRR’s current practice.
 - RATIONALE: Consistency in language across both the Code of Student Conduct and the Code of Academic Integrity and in SRR’s practices. Additionally, to ensure accessibility of the Code of Academic Integrity to members of the community.
- Removing the line, “The instructor of record for a given course is solely responsible for establishing academic assignments and methods of examination in that course.”
 - RATIONALE: The Committee outlined this varies by academic unit/department. Upon discussion, the committee also questioned the relevance of this line being present in the Code of Academic Integrity.

Topics Discussed and not recommended:

- Ongoing conversations are occurring with the committee and staff in the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment regarding preventing a student from completing a course evaluation if they have been found responsible for academic dishonesty. After conducting outreach to our institutional peers about this, the responses that we received indicate this is not a current practice.
 - RATIONALE: Addressing concerns from reporting instructors of preventing potential bias from students who have been reported for academic dishonesty in a given course. Although this is not a proposed change to add to the Code, reporting instructors do have discretion on a sanction recommendation at the beginning of the process.
- Define what decision the Provost or their designee can make in connection to an appeal submitted by a respondent.
 - RATIONALE: The decision was made to keep the appeals process as it currently reads to allow the Provost or their designee reviewing the appeal flexibility in making their determination about a specific case, and when applicable this would allow for a more expedient decision to be rendered when a potential outcome needs to be modified.

THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

Proposed Code of Academic Integrity Changes for Fall 2023





Seeking Community Feedback: Annual Code Review

Review process overview



Adding new guidance on case procedures



**Revisions to record maintenance and retention
in SRR**



Changes for clarity and consistency.



Additions:

- **Warning Process as a way to resolve cases of academic dishonesty:**
 - Instructor determines the circumstances of the case are low-level (i.e. not egregious enough to warrant a grade-related sanction)
 - Instructor will report to SRR and SRR notifies the student
 - Student has the option to dispute the Warning
 - SRR will notify Instructor
 - Instructor has the option to move forward with the Panel process if they believe it is worth pursuing



Additions:

- **Procedural Guidance & Clarifying Rights for Respondents:**
 - Aligns with current the Code of Student Conduct and current practices
 - Allows SRR along with the Presiding Officer of an Academic Integrity Panel to determine what information is relevant.



Additions:

- **Defining the term "graduation" as it relates to record maintenance:**
 - "Completion of degree requirements at any post-secondary institution, not solely the George Washington University."
 - Allows more records to be eligible for administrative archival status (not subject to typical release to third parties)



Additions:

- **The Code of Academic Integrity (“Code”) shall apply to students enrolled in all colleges and schools within the University; except the following schools and programs:**
 1. The Law School
 2. The Medical Doctor program in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences
 3. **Students admitted to the University through any Pre-College Programs for the duration of their enrollment in that Pre-College Program.**



Revisions


- Cheating: Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise; engaging in unauthorized collaboration in any academic exercise; submitting work for an in-class examination that has been prepared in advance without authorization; copying from another student's examination; representing material prepared by another as one's own work (including contract or paid cheating); violating rules governing administration of examinations; violating any rules relating to the academic integrity of a course or program.



- Cheating: Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise; engaging in unauthorized collaboration in any academic exercise; submitting work for an in-class examination that has been prepared in advance without authorization; copying from another student's examination; **representing material not prepared by the student as one's own work** (including contract or paid cheating); violating rules governing administration of examinations; violating any rules relating to the academic integrity of a course or program.



Revisions

- Intentional plagiarism: Deliberately or knowingly using and representing **another person's** words, ideas, sequence of ideas, data, and/or other work material without proper acknowledgment, citation, or attribution. Material does not need to be copied verbatim to constitute intentional plagiarism. **Contract or paid cheating may constitute intentional plagiarism.**
- 
- Intentional plagiarism: Deliberately or knowingly using and representing words, ideas, sequence of ideas, data, and/or other work material without proper acknowledgment, citation, or attribution. Material does not need to be copied verbatim to constitute intentional plagiarism.



Revisions

- However reported, the instructor of record **will** present the student with specific allegations and may propose a sanction. The instructor of record may consult with SRR on sanctioning considerations. Sanctions will be determined in accordance with the relevant sections of this Code.



- However reported, the instructor of record **is encouraged to** present the student with specific allegations and may propose a sanction. The instructor of record may consult with SRR on sanctioning considerations. Sanctions will be determined in accordance with the relevant sections of this Code.



Revisions

- Following graduation or removal of transcript notation, whichever is later, the respondent's record will be transferred to an administrative archive status and therefore become internal and administrative (i.e. non-conduct) records. Such files are not part of general third-party releases, even with authorization from the respondent. Such records may be released to third-parties upon specific request of the respondent or as required by law.



- Following graduation or three (3) years from the date of the incident, whichever is later, case records that do not include expulsion, suspension, or an active transcript notation will be transferred to an administrative archive status and therefore become internal and administrative (i.e. non-conduct) records. Case records that include suspension will be transferred to administrative archive status upon the successful petition of the transcript notation removal. Case records including expulsions are never transferred to administrative archive status. Files that are transferred to administrative archive status are not part of general third-party releases, even with authorization from the respondent. Such records may be released to third parties upon specific request of the respondent or as required by law.



Changes for clarity

- **Amending the approval process so that final approval rests with the Provost and President of the University**
 - Substantial changes will then be forwarded to the President of the University for [approval/confirmation] ~~and submission to the Board of Trustees.~~



Minor changes for clarity

- **Changing "Sanction Violation" to "Outcome Violation"**
 - **Mirroring language in the Code of Student Conduct**
- **Removing the line:**
 - **"The instructor of record for a given course is solely responsible for establishing academic assignments and methods of examination in that course."**
 - **The creation of assignments and examinations methods is a collaborative process that varies by academic unit/department/discipline**

THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

Questions & Discussion

Student Rights & Responsibilities
rights@gwu.edu





Faculty Senate

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

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate is the agency to which the President initially presents information and which they consult concerning proposed changes in existing policies or promulgation of new policies¹;

WHEREAS, the functions of the Faculty Senate are to formulate principles and objectives and find facts, so as to recommend policies to the President and also provide the President and the Board of Trustees with advice and counsel on such matters as they may request¹;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) shall serve as a channel through which any member of the Assembly may introduce matters for the consideration of the Senate²;

WHEREAS, FSEC shall receive reports prepared by or in any college, school, or division of the University that may be of concern or interest to any or all other colleges, schools, or divisions, or to the faculty generally, and arrange for distribution of copies thereof to such other college, school, or division or the faculty²;

WHEREAS, FSEC shall serve as the committee on committees for the Faculty Senate and in that capacity nominate the members and chairmen of the standing and special committees, each with specific areas of expertise enumerated in the bylaws of the Faculty Senate and established by the senate for that purpose²;

WHEREAS, FSEC members do not have universal knowledge across all topics that may concern the university, but they do have knowledge of which faculty bodies have expertise in which particular area, therefore their function is to convey information to other such faculty bodies and determine the appropriate faculty body for consultation;

WHEREAS, the Senate (SR 22/13) recommends that future discussions of shared governance appreciate the vital importance of Senate committees, where faculty and staff collaboratively bring their expertise to bear in policymaking and problem solving, and that providing these committees with meaningful opportunities to participate in policymaking and strategic planning in their respective areas, as mandated by the FOP, is essential for the success of our mission as a university;

WHEREAS, direct interpretation of the Faculty Organization Plan (FOP III.5.b) indicates that FSEC exceeds its authority if it keeps information secret from other faculty bodies, especially Senate Committees, other than information related to personnel decisions such as non-concurrence cases, grievance procedures, and procedures for dismissal of faculty for a cause described in the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code; and

WHEREAS, FSEC has exceeded its authority by holding confidential deliberations with the Administration in the past, for example in the case of a new policy on arming GW Police Officers³;

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

² FOP, Article III, Section 5(b)

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted to the FSEC and endorsed by:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Faculty Senate

Statement by the Outgoing (2022-2023) Faculty Senate Executive Committee on Confidentiality

Prompted by recent questions about confidential communications with the Administration and the Board of Trustees, the outgoing (2022-2023) Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) wishes to make a statement:

FSEC acknowledges that on the issue of arming the GW Police Force, the faculty and Senate are concerned about to what extent FSEC knew or condoned these plans.

FSEC, at its meeting on February 17, 2023, was briefly informed that the Board was thinking about possible changes to the GWPD policy of no firearms. The administration requested confidentiality from all present, as occasionally happens in a Senate committee meeting when a matter is still hypothetical. Therefore, the item was not included in the FSEC Chair's March 10th Report to the Senate.

FSEC was informed on March 31 that the President was charged by the Board to develop an implementation plan to partially arm GWPD. FSEC expressed to the President disagreement with the Board's decision and objection to the lack of consultation with the community. The President reiterated that the Board had unilaterally made the decision and all he had authority to undertake was development of an implementation plan. The President asked FSEC for and received suggestions on including broader security improvements in the implementation plan. FSEC recommended transparency in announcing the Board-mandated change and discouraged him from pursuing an Executive Session of the Senate. The President requested confidentiality from FSEC until the plan was developed and presented to the Board on April 11. On April 12, the President informed FSEC he would announce the plan and take questions at the Senate meeting on April 14.

It is FSEC's conviction that neither the President nor FSEC took these discussions to replace a cornerstone of Shared Governance, namely proper and meaningful consultation with faculty bodies. Indeed, in both FSEC meetings and in subsequent public communications, the President stressed messages like the one in his announcement email on April 13: "the Board noted its great responsibility, in its oversight role, to protect the safety of the GW community" and "We [the administration] will launch an effort to gain community input and feedback on implementation, as well as other priorities for reimagining public safety at our university. We will also discuss this topic tomorrow with the Faculty Senate. Our engagement will continue with the broader GW community, with opportunities to share feedback and input, including through submission of comments and questions via the GWPD website."

At no point did either FSEC or the President imply that informing FSEC would replace or preclude consultation with the Senate and faculty.

Previous administrations have claimed that informing FSEC or informal discussions with FSEC constitutes faculty consultation. That is not the case, except in an emergency. Previous administrations have also claimed that informing the FSEC Chair or informal discussions with the FSEC Chair constitutes faculty consultation. That is not the case. It is also vital that the FSEC Chair informs FSEC of confidential information the Chair receives separately, except for specific cases enumerated in the Faculty Organization Plan and the Faculty Code. FSEC will greatly profit from a candid discussion about confidentiality in this case and, in general, befitting an academic institution, in the Senate and its Committees.

May 1, 2023



Faculty Senate

Statement by the Incoming (2023-2024) Faculty Senate Executive Committee on Confidentiality

Prompted by recent concerns from Senators about confidential communications between the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) and the Administration, the Chair of FSEC will request an Executive Session at the May Senate meeting for a discussion about the role of FSEC in facilitating shared governance, including questions about the handling of confidential discussions within the Senate and its Committees and in discussions with the Administration or the Board of Trustees. This discussion will consider the language of the governing documents (the *Faculty Organization Plan* (FOP) and the *Faculty Code*) as well as the document on Shared Principles of Shared Governance recently agreed to by the Senate, Administration, and the Board.

FSEC's aim is not to usurp the proper role of committees in providing meaningful consultation on policies and decisions. The governing documents describe specific responsibilities for FSEC and/or the FSEC chair on issues that pertain to personnel matters, nonconcurrences, appointments of administrative leaders, etc. In other situations, information brought to FSEC in discussions with the administration does not constitute meaningful and adequate consultation of faculty under the principles of Shared Governance.

FSEC is mindful of the consequences if there is no agreed-upon mechanism for information sharing that is accepted by the Senate, the Board, and the Administration. If FSEC is uncertain whether it can receive confidential information or information that is potentially confidential, the Board and Administration may decide to not share it, thus effectively cutting out the Senate from early-stage deliberations. That will reduce the opportunity to influence the discussion in early stages of the decision-making process. Therefore, clarity about which faculty body can handle confidential information (consistent with transparency requirements in the FOP) is needed.

Following the executive session discussion, it may be appropriate for the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom to propose to the Senate clearer guidelines and (if deemed necessary) changes to the FOP to deal with confidential or sensitive information, to better communicate such information, to ensure that proper and meaningful consultation is facilitated, and to resolve differences between the FOP and the Shared Principles of Shared Governance. These deliberations should also address the sharing of controversial or confidential information in Senate committees, including the timing and necessity of reporting hypothetical or yet to be announced information with the full Senate.

May 1, 2023

Joint Committee Report on Classroom Recordings

**Educational Policy & Technology; Appointment, Salary &
Promotion Policy; Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom**

May 12, 2023

Members: ASPP Co-chairs Murli Gupta and Susan LeLacheur; PEAFF Co-chairs Guillermo Orti and Natalie Houghton-; EPT Co-chairs, Sarah Wagner and Irene Foster; and EPT Subcommittee on Classroom Recordings Chair Katrin Schultheiss

Context

The need for a clear set of policies on classroom recordings

- Previous discussions of intellectual property (including Resolution 21/9 on GW Course Intellectual Property and Digital Recording)
- COVID-19 remote instruction and DSS accommodation policy
- Concerns about use beyond classroom instruction
- Technological parameters of recording, selective release, and deletion

Specific **FSEC charge to both EPT and ASPP 2022-2023**: Consider the issue of whether GW can mandate the recording of classroom interactions (and post them online).

Classroom recording was among PEAFF's charge the previous year; raised this year via FSEC-PEAFF liaison.

Joint Committee

EPT, ASPP, and PEAFF: The committees approached the issue from their respective mandates (e.g., educational mission; faculty assessment and promotion; academic freedom)

- EPT formed a subcommittee (chaired by Katrin Schultheiss) in Oct 2022; it has discussed the issue multiple meetings since Fall 2020, and during 8 meetings in AY2022-2023: Aug 19, Oct 21, Nov 18, Dec 16, Jan 20, Feb 17, Mar 24, April 21. Joint report included in EPT final report submitted April 6.
- ASPP discussed the issue at 6 meetings in AY2022-2023: Sept 30, Oct 28, Dec 2, Jan 27, Feb 24, and Mar 31. Submitted a document (dated April 3) to FSEC for inclusion in the April agenda of Faculty Senate (see Senate minutes for April meeting).
- PEAFF discussed the issue at 2 meetings in AY2022-2023: Nov 3, and Mar 6; shared the joint report with PEAFF on May 5.
- PEAFF, ASPP, and EPT subcommittee chairs met on Dec 7; and with VP Hammond on Jan 18.
- **Faculty survey** administered in November 2022

Executive summary

In November 2022, the **Faculty Senate administered a survey** of all faculty (excluding the Law School*) to assess current recording practices and gauge concerns about current policy.

Key findings:

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

Executive Summary continued

Guidance from the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs

Representatives from the Senate's PEAFF, ASPP, and EPT Committees met with Vice-Provost Emily Hammond on January 18, 2023, to clarify current university policies on classroom recordings. VP Hammond explained, among other things, that:

1. faculty retain ownership of the intellectual property contained in the recordings;
2. recordings may be reviewed without faculty consent to comply with legal proceedings;
3. the university retains legal ownership of the files that are recorded using university equipment or software; and
4. because the university retains ownership of the files, administrators have the right to review recordings for “valid reasons” without informing the faculty member.

Currently, there is no formal mechanism for informing or seeking consent from regular faculty members whose recordings are under review.

Executive Summary continued

Guidance from Yordanos Baharu, Executive Director of Academic Enterprise Applications

In response to query from the EPT subcommittee, he explained that faculty have the technical capability to erase recordings on most platforms.

This capability would seem to complicate the question of ownership of files.

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

If Faculty Do Not Delete Their Recordings, How Long Does the University Keep Recordings?

DATE	PLATFORM	FILES MOVED TO FACULTY TRASH FOLDER	FILES PERMANENTLY DELETED & CANNOT BE RECOVERED
As of 1 January 2023	Video Recordings Stored in Web Conferencing Tools	After 180 days	After 30 days
As of 30 June 2023	All Video Recordings	After 180 days	After 30 days

Recommendations

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

Recommendation #1

The administration/academic technology team should work to improve faculty awareness of recording options and simplify processes for selective/adaptive release, stop/start recording, editing recordings, and erasing recordings.

Recommendation #2

The administration should issue a statement as well as add a pop-up box to the recording set-up protocols clarifying that:

- a. faculty retain intellectual property rights over the content of their recorded classes.
- b. administrators will not access classroom recordings without the instructor's consent except when there is an external controlling statutory authority.
- c. faculty retain the right to deny GW administrators access to recordings without reprisal.
- d. faculty retain the right to edit or erase classroom recordings.

Recommendation #3

The administration should inform all faculty of these policies in a dedicated e-mail sent before the start of the Fall 2023 semester.



Faculty Senate

Classroom Recordings Policy Report: Executive Summary and Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Feb. 9, 2023

Contents:

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

Summary of Survey

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

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

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

Faculty Recording Policies

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Faculty Experiences with Recording:

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

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

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

Reasons for Recording:

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

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

Reasons for Not Recording Classes:

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

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

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

CONCLUSIONS FROM SURVEY DATA:

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

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

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

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

1. Copyright of Intellectual Property

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

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

2. Access to recordings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Notes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Question 2: How long does the university keep recordings?

In an email sent to all users on 12/19/22, the following retention plan was defined:

“Video recordings stored in web conferencing tools as of **January 1, 2023**, will be saved for **180 days**. After 180 days, recordings will be moved to the meeting host’s “Trash” folder for an additional **30 days**. Once the 30-day Trash countdown expires, the recordings will be permanently deleted and cannot be recovered. On **June 30, 2023**, all recordings that are older than 180 days will be moved to the meeting host’s “Trash” folder for 30 days. Once the 30-day Trash countdown expires, the recordings will be permanently deleted and cannot be recovered.”



Final Report 2022-2023

The Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) had a busy year addressing the Charges given to it by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), as well as requests for review of policies by the University's Office of Ethics, Compliance and Risk, and issues such as proposed amendments to individual Schools and Colleges' by-laws by the Provost's Office. **Three resolutions were offered and adopted by the Faculty Senate (23/4, 23/6, and 23/8).** At the request of faculty members, PEAFF also initiated discussions about Academic Freedom at its April meeting in light of the complaint made to the US Department of Education on behalf of students against a professor. No recommendations were made at this time, but it was agreed that the issue should continue to be discussed and more information about existing University policies and statements about Academic Freedom included in the Faculty Code should be more broadly disseminated to faculty and students. It should perhaps be included as a Charge to the 2023-2024 PEAFF Committee. The information gathered by PEAFF about Academic Freedom can be found in the April 2023 meeting minutes. The Committee held regular meetings throughout the academic year, except for the month of January. The minutes of the meetings are attached to this Report.

The four charges received by PEAFF from the FSEC were:

- (1) **Review the Faculty Organization Plan** and make recommendations for revisions, building on the work of the committee last year and the work of the present ad hoc committee considering Faculty Assembly membership.
 - **RESULTS:** Faculty Senate Resolution 23/6 was adopted by the Faculty Senate with proposed changes to the Faculty Organization Plan, mostly centering on updating technical language to align it with, for example, the current titles of University Officers who are members of the Faculty Senate, and regularizing the use of virtual and hybrid meeting formats in addition to the in-person format for both regular and specially called meetings of the Faculty Senate.
 - There is not yet consensus on the true number of faculty who are members of the Faculty Assembly, so the proposal made by last year's PEAFF committee to use a percentage of the membership as a quorum was not included in this year's resolution.

- (2) **Representation of the College of Professional Studies on the Senate.**
 - **RESULTS:** Resolution 23/8 was adopted by the Faculty Senate with the recommendation to include two "Delegates" from the College of Professional Studies' Faculty with voice but no vote in the Faculty Senate and one non-voting member in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The proposed changes to the Faculty Organization Plan were adopted as part of the resolution, and included a provision that the voting status of the CPS Delegates be reviewed in three years to see if they should be given

the right to vote, regardless of their tenure status, which was the rationale for not giving them voice *and* vote at present.

- (3) **Review the procedures for appointing the Faculty Consultative Committee** that works with presidential search processes.
 - **RESULTS:** There continues to be disagreement about how best to constitute the committee for future Presidential searches. It was determined that the conversation about representation should be continued next year, as there is (hopefully!) no need to establish a new FCC any time soon with the selection of Ellen Granburg, PhD, as the 19th President of GW.
- (4) **Assess the Faculty Code for areas needing updates** ahead of the upcoming three-year review process to be undertaken with the Board.
 - **RESULTS:** Among the areas that were raised for consideration to be revised or updated in the Faculty Code were: promotion and tenure procedures, Dean evaluation procedures, and extensions of parental childcare to other family responsibilities (e.g., eldercare leave). No specific recommendations for revisions were made, as the Faculty Code Subcommittee and PEAf itself ran out of time to consider these potential revisions.

Policies reviewed by the Committee included:

- Mandatory Title IX training for the faculty (see Resolution 23/4 adopted by the Senate)
- Institutional Conflict of Interest
- Classroom Recordings Policies (see attached Executive Summary and Recommendations Report)
- Academic Freedom (see the April 2023 minutes)

Appendices attached to this report:

- PEAf Minutes for 2022-2023
- Faculty Senate Resolutions 23/4, 23/6, and 23/8
- Classroom Recordings Policies Executive Summary and Recommendations Report

Respectfully submitted,
Professor Guillermo Orti, Co-Chair
Professor Natalie Houghtby-Haddon, Co-Chair



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PEAf MEETING
HELD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2022
VIA ZOOM

Present: Provost Bracey; Co-Chairs Houghtby-Haddon and Ortí; Professors Clayton, El-Ghazawi, Glenn, Griesshammer, Jacobsen, Koch, Munar, Stein, Waraksa Wasserman.

Absent: Vice Provost Hammond; Professors Abrams, Anderson, Attia, Bhati, Biles, Cohen-Cole, Cseh, Darr, Hovander, Kyriakopoulos, Meier, Patel, Robinson, Schwartz, Sen, Weitzner, Whitt.

Meeting called to order at 2:01 pm

Co-chairs Orti and Houghtby-Haddon opened the meeting and welcomed the committee members to the first meeting of the academic year.

Provost Bracey shared how his office and PEAf have collaborated together over the years on issues such as the updating of the Faculty Code; he looks forward to that kind of collaboration this year. Issues that he sees the committee addressing include:

- National Security: Helping to develop a university-wide policy addressing changing regulations about faculty and others' interactions with foreign nationals, including research, both inside and outside of the US. Issues may include: How will faculty be asked to disclose these relationships? What should compliance procedures look like? What counts as a conflict of interest?
- Title IX: forthcoming revisions. Establishing mandatory training for faculty; currently faculty completion rates are below 20%, which is unacceptable—to protect faculty members themselves, as well as the University.
- Faculty Code: revisions pending from last year, to be presented to the Board of Trustees' 3-year cycle of reviewing the Code.

Introduction of Committee members: participants introduced themselves by sharing their names, their schools/departments, and previous experience with PEAf

Overview of the committee's purpose and recent business

- Co-chair Orti briefly outlined the purpose of PEAf as described on the Faculty Senate [website](#).
- Co-chair Orti recommended that committee members familiarize themselves with the resolutions drafted by PEAf last year that were sent back to committee by the Senate; these are:

- **Resolution 22/7** To Implement a Faculty Consultative Committee in Presidential Searches (posted with the [agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting of March 2022](#))
- **Resolution 23/1** On Recommended Changes to the Faculty Organization Plan (posted with the [agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting of May 2022](#))

The charge for PEAFF from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) for this academic year has not yet been received, but the Co-chairs identified likely issues that will be assigned to the committee, including the issues mentioned by the Provost, the tabled resolutions from last year, and the issue of Classroom recordings, a topic that was assigned to PEAFF last year but wasn't dealt with.

FSEC Liaison Prof. Greishammer also shared that a Task Force has been set up by FSEC to study how to define members of the Faculty Assembly (likely to be announced at the next Faculty Senate meeting), an important issue related to revisions of the Faculty Organization Plan (FOP). PEAFF will be the recipient of recommendations from this task force as it considers changes to the FOP.

Questions and Comments

- The meeting ended with questions asked about how the committee operates, and suggestions for recording the meetings so that members who are unable to attend can stay abreast of the monthly meetings. In addition, how the committee works through subcommittees was discussed.

Closing

- The committee adjourned at approximately 3:10pm.



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PEAFF MEETING
HELD ON OCTOBER 6, 2022
VIA ZOOM

Present: Co-Chairs Houghtby-Haddon and Ortí; Professors, Cseh, El-Ghazawi, Gastwirth, Glenn, Griesshammer, Hovander, Jacobsen, Koch, Kyriakopoulos, Munar, Stein, Waraksa, Weitzner.

Absent: Vice Provost Hammond; Professors Abrams, Anderson, Attia, Bhati, Biles, Cohen-Cole, Clayton, Darr, Meier, Patel, Robinson, Schwartz, Sen, Wasserman, Whitt.

Meeting called to order at 2:05 pm

1. Minutes of previous meeting (09/08/2022) were approved.
2. Co-Chairs reported on previous actions that did not require PEAFF input such as minor review of ESIA bylaws. Ortí reported on proceedings of the Task Force reviewing Faculty Assembly membership, currently collecting more information.
3. Charges from FSEC were discussed and subcommittees will be formed by the PEAFF membership to address each of them individually (FOP review, CPS senate representation, FCC appointment, and Faculty Code updates).
4. An additional issue communicated by FSEC liaison Griesshammer concerns ownership and use of classroom recordings. A dedicated subcommittee will be formed to study this issue.
5. The issue of Title IX training for faculty was added to the charges for PEAFF by request from the Provost's office. There is concern about the low completion rate of training courses by faculty (around 20%), and the question is how to improve compliance and whether making training for faculty mandatory is a viable option. An additional subcommittee was proposed to study this issue and provide recommendations.
6. A new proposed Institutional Conflict of Interest Policy was reviewed and discussed following a brief introduction by Associate Vice President Dorinda Tucker (Office of Ethics, Compliance, Risk & Privacy) and Ashley Fountain (Director of Ethics and Compliance, Office of Ethics, Compliance, Risk & Privacy). The PEAFF committee approved the following recommendations to amend the Policy:
 - a. "Standing Review Committee Members" should include, at a minimum, two external members without university affiliation
 - b. "Standing Review Committee Members" should include a member of the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, in addition to the two faculty members previously suggested
 - c. "Standing Review Committee Members" should include the Vice Provost for Information Technology, or another senior member of university IT leadership

- d. The policy should include a section on procedures for resolving disputes about conflicts (cf. [the Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Investigators Policy](#)), or other guidance regarding consequences for conduct found impermissible (see above policy section B.10)"

Closing

- The committee adjourned at approximately 3:10pm.



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PEAf MEETING
HELD ON November 3, 2022
VIA ZOOM

Present: Co-Chairs Houghtby-Haddon and Ortí; Professors Biles, Clayton, Cohen-Cole, Cseh, Darr, El-Ghazawi, Gastwirth, Glenn, Jacobsen, Koch, Patel, Stein, Waraksa, Weitzner, Whitt.

Absent: Vice Provost Hammond; Professors Abrams, Anderson, Attia, Bhati, Deng, Griesshammer, Hovander, Kyriakopoulos, Meier, Munar, Robinson, Schwartz, Sen, Wasserman.

Meeting called to order at 2:05 pm

1. Minutes of previous meeting (10/06/2022) were approved.
2. **A possible routine of recording meetings** was discussed. The reason to make recordings is to provide access to discussions for PEAf members who could not attend a meeting. But several potential problems were noted: (i) recording may inhibit frank discussion, (ii) managing access to recording is an added burden to organizers; (iii) controlling potential dissemination of recordings is difficult to implement and may cause recordings to land in the wrong hands, a worrisome outcome especially when discussions involve “sensitive” issues. The sense of the committee was against this proposal and it was decided to not implement zoom recordings for PEAf meetings.
3. **Updates from the Senate and Assembly meetings:** a summary of the Senate meeting was presented, noting that minutes¹ of are available online for more details. Regarding the Faculty Assembly held on October 24, that meeting was called to order at 4:04pm, but the meeting did not yet have a quorum at this point; thus, the President indicated that the minutes would be approved once a quorum (125 members) was achieved². This quorum was obtained about 30 minutes later, and the Assembly was then able to vote to approve minutes of the previous meeting. This is an important observation considering the charge made to PEAf to revise the definition of Assembly membership and necessary quorum specified by the Faculty Organization Plan.
4. **Resolution on Title IX Training for faculty:** The Provost’s office asked PEAf to study this issue and propose a solution to address the low proportion (~20%) of faculty taking this training. A draft resolution (pasted below) was presented to the committee (drafted by G.O. and vetted by VP Hammond) to propose that that this training be mandatory. Comments received and discussed during the meeting include: (i) the low frequency of faculty taking

¹ <https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/blogs.gwu.edu/dist/0/196/files/2022/10/Oct-2022-minutes-attachments-1.pdf>

² <https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/blogs.gwu.edu/dist/0/196/files/2022/10/2022-Faculty-Assembly-DRAFT-minutes-10-27-2022.pdf>

this training could be due to poor messaging and bad timing (message was sent in early July, middle of summer term, when many nine-month appointed faculty are not engaged), therefore repeated messaging may have better results; (ii) the resolution could include references to the modality by which this training is offered and perhaps include offering more modalities (online, in person); (iii) the training frequency may be annual or maybe with ‘refreshers’ every 2-3 years to diminish the burden. The problem of managing and enforcing sporadic training requirements gets more complicated if it is not annual. It would be simpler to have this requirement tied to the submission of Annual Reports by the faculty; (iv) there was a sense that enforcement with penalties may be less desirable than encouragement with “carrots;” (v) an additional resolving clause seems necessary to explain how the Provost’s office may design the management or enforcement of such training and whether this will be part of the annual report working. In conclusion, the committee is open to support a revised version of this resolution that considers the above concerns.

5. **Subcommittees:** the membership of each of four subcommittees (FOP revisions, CPS senate representation, FCC appointment, and Faculty Code updates) was discussed and it was resolved that each subcommittee needs to schedule a meeting as soon as possible

Closing

- The committee adjourned at approximately 3:05 pm.

A RESOLUTION ON TITLE IX TRAINING FOR FACULTY

WHEREAS The university must comply with a wide range of laws, regulations, and policies that govern its various activities;

WHEREAS the George Washington University complies with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972³ (“Title IX”), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in the university's programs and activities; the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act), as amended by the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013⁴ (VAWA), which, with Title IX, governs Policy related to the university’s response to sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence and stalking; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964⁵ (“Title VII”), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in employment; the District of Columbia Human Rights Act; and other applicable law;

WHEREAS The George Washington University is committed to maintaining a positive climate for study and work, in which individuals are judged solely on relevant factors, such as skill and

³ <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/05/19/2020-10512/nondiscrimination-on-the-basis-of-sex-in-education-programs-or-activities-receiving-federal>

⁴ <https://www.justice.gov/tribal/2013-and-2022-reauthorizations-violence-against-women-act-vawa>

⁵ <https://www.justice.gov/crt/laws-enforced-employment-litigation-section>

performance, and can pursue their activities in an atmosphere that is free from discrimination, harassment, and violence;

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees has adopted explicit Policy, Title IX Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct Policy⁶, to inform members of the university community about the university's prohibition against Sexual Harassment and retaliation and also provides information about resources, reporting options, and prompt and equitable resolution options;

WHEREAS Faculty are governed by this Policy;

WHEREAS Faculty are “Designated Reporters” and as such they are *required by the Title IX Policy to promptly report* any information they learn about suspected or alleged Sexual Harassment or potential violations of this Policy to the university’s Title IX Coordinator;

WHEREAS GW’s Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Risk has designed and offers online training sessions on matters defined by the Title IX Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct Policy but voluntary training of Faculty has resulted in very low levels of participation;

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

1. That the Senate supports mandatory Title IX training for all faculty to facilitate and foster a positive climate for study and work across all campuses and to facilitate their obligation as reporters in cases of suspected or alleged Sexual Harassment or potential violations of this Policy to the university’s Title IX Coordinator.
2. That the Senate supports mandating faculty to refresh and update their Title IX training annually or every time Title IX Policy is revised;
3. Implementation Provost, tie to annual report? HOW?

⁶ <https://compliance.gwu.edu/title-ix-sexual-harassment-and-related-conduct-policy>



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PEAf MEETING
HELD ON December 1, 2022
VIA ZOOM

Present: Co-Chairs Houghtby-Haddon and Ortí; Professors Attia, Cohen-Cole, Cseh, Darr, El-Ghazawi, Gastwirth, Glenn, Griesshammer, Koch, Kyriakopoulos, Munar, Patel, Schwartz, Stein, Waraksa, Wasserman, and Whitt.

Absent: Vice Provost Hammond; Professors Abrams, Anderson, Bhati, Biles, Deng, Clayton, Hovander, Jacobsen, Meier, Robinson, Sen, and Weitzner.

Meeting called to order at 2:05 pm

1. Minutes of previous meeting (11/03/2022) were approved.
2. **Resolution on Title IX Training for faculty:** A revised version of the resolution that reflected proposals for amendments received since our last meeting (mainly via email) was presented to initiate discussion (attached below). Several changes to RC3 were considered and voted in turn. A final version of the resolution was approved by majority vote. (17 positive votes).
3. **Report from the “ad hoc committee” on Faculty Assembly Membership** (by G. Ortí): the *ad hoc* committee recommended no change to the current definition of membership (Faculty Organization Plan, Article II, Section 1). In light of this recommendation, PEAf initiated discussions to address the FSEC charge to “Review the Faculty Organization Plan and make recommendations for revisions, building on the work of the committee last year and the work of the present ad hoc committee considering Faculty Assembly membership.” The discussion highlighted problems and ambiguities in the current definition, but these will be addressed directly by the appropriate subcommittee that is being scheduled to meet as soon as possible

Closing

- The committee adjourned at approximately 3:25 pm.

A RESOLUTION ON TITLE IX TRAINING FOR FACULTY

WHEREAS The university must comply with a wide range of laws, regulations, and policies that govern its various activities;

WHEREAS the George Washington University complies with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972¹ (“Title IX”), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in the university's programs and activities; the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act² (Clery Act), and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act³ (VAWA), which, with Title IX, governs policies related to the university’s response to sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964⁴ (“Title VII”), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in employment; the District of Columbia Human Rights Act⁵; and other applicable law;

WHEREAS The George Washington University is committed to maintaining a positive climate for study and work, in which individuals are judged solely on relevant factors, such as skill and performance, and can pursue their activities in an atmosphere that is free from discrimination, harassment, and violence;

WHEREAS The George Washington University, after consultation with the Faculty Senate, adopted the Title IX Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct Policy (the “Title IX Policy”)⁶, to inform members of the university community about the university's prohibition against sexual harassment and retaliation and also provides information about resources, reporting options, and prompt and equitable resolution options, and the Equal Opportunity, Nondiscrimination, Anti-Harassment and Non-Retaliation Policy (the “EEO Policy”)⁷, to inform members of the university community about the university’s commitment to maintaining a nondiscriminatory, harassment-free, diverse work and education environment and also provides information about resources and reporting options;

WHEREAS Faculty are governed by the Title IX and the EEO Policy;

¹ <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/05/19/2020-10512/nondiscrimination-on-the-basis-of-sex-in-education-programs-or-activities-receiving-federal>

² <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2014-10-20/pdf/2014-24284.pdf>

³ <https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/senate-bill/47>

⁴ <https://www.justice.gov/crt/laws-enforced-employment-litigation-section>

⁵ <https://code.dccouncil.gov/us/dc/council/code/titles/2/chapters/14/>

⁶ <https://compliance.gwu.edu/title-ix-sexual-harassment-and-related-conduct-policy>

⁷ <https://compliance.gwu.edu/equal-opportunity-nondiscrimination-anti-harassment-and-non-retaliation>

WHEREAS Faculty are “Designated Reporters” and as such they are *required by the Title IX Policy to promptly report* any information they learn about suspected or alleged sexual harassment or potential violations of the Title IX Policy to the university’s Title IX Coordinator;

WHEREAS GW’s Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Risk has designed and offers online training sessions on matters defined by the Title IX Policy and the EEO Policy but voluntary training of Faculty has resulted in very low levels of participation;

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

1. That the Senate supports mandatory Title IX/EEO training for all faculty to facilitate and foster a positive climate for study and work across all campuses and to facilitate their obligation as reporters in cases of suspected or alleged Sexual Harassment or potential violations of the Title IX Policy to the university’s Title IX Coordinator.
2. That the Senate supports mandating faculty to refresh and update their Title IX/EEO training ~~annually or~~ every time the Title IX Policy is revised;
3. That the Provost identify effective means for faculty to participate in the Title IX/EEO training ~~that will encourage compliance, understanding that failure to timely take the Title IX/EEO training may subject the violator to disciplinary and/or corrective action, which will depend on the particular circumstances of the violation.~~

Alternative RC 3. ~~That the Senate supports the Provost’s efforts to~~ identify effective means for faculty to participate in the Title IX/EEO training that will encourage compliance, understanding that failure to timely take the Title IX/EEO training may subject the violator to ~~appropriate~~ disciplinary and/or corrective action, which will depend on the particular circumstances of the violation.

Addendum

After the PEAf meeting, the resolution was posted with the agenda for the Senate meeting, eliciting discussion by senators. Two additional amendments were proposed based on input from faculty senators. Both amendments were individually circulated to the PEAf committee members, and a vote was solicited via email. Both amendments were approved by positive votes by the majority of the committee. These two amendments are listed below and were inserted into a substitute resolution that was presented to the Faculty Senate at the December 9 meeting.

RC3: That the Senate recommends that such training contains best practices, is targeted and appropriate for an academic setting, and is limited in scope to matters directly related to Title IX, and that the Provost identify (a) effective means for faculty to participate in the Title IX/EEO training, (b) appropriate times to communicate with faculty about deadlines, and (c) adequate timelines for completing the training.

(last whereas clause) WHEREAS, GW's Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Risk has designed and offers online training sessions on matters defined by the Title IX Policy and the EEO Policy but this resource does not effectively address actions expected for the designated-reporter role faculty have under current policy and is otherwise inappropriate to academic settings, and communication to faculty about the existence of this resource has been ineffective to achieve high levels of participation;

Finally, the resolution was approved by the Senate on Dec. 9 with an additional amendment proposed by Prof. Wirtz (see final version [here](#))



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PEAf MEETING
HELD ON February 6, 2023
VIA ZOOM

Present: Co-Chairs Houghtby-Haddon and Ortí; Vice Provost Hammond; Professors Clayton, Darr, El-Ghazawi, Gastwirth, Glenn, Hovander, Jacobsen, Koch, Kyriakopoulos, Patel, Stein, Waraksa, and Wasserman.

Absent: Professors Attia Abrams, Anderson, Bhati, Biles, Cohen-Cole, Cseh, Deng, Griesshammer, Meier, Munar Robinson, Schwartz, Sen, Weitzner, and Whitt.

Meeting called to order at 9:55 am

1. Minutes of previous meeting (12/01/2022) were approved.

Subcommittee reports

- **FOP:** A summary was presented of the meeting held on Dec 8, 2022. Most of that meeting was devoted to discussing the issue of Faculty Assembly membership. Due to lack of progress or conclusions from the special ‘task force’ appointed by FSEC, several options were presented. In the absence of actual samples of “affiliation agreements” for medical staff at Children’s Hospital and the Veterans Administration that were not provided by the administration of the SMHS or the Provost, the subcommittee cannot determine whether such medical faculty should be necessarily included in the Assembly membership. Obtaining this information seems a necessary first step to revise any definition of membership based on “affiliation agreements.”
A suggestion was made to directly engage with Children’s Hospital faculty leadership, to ask them if most faculty consider membership in the Faculty Assembly a critical right in relation to their work for GW.
Other suggestions involved a definition of membership contingent on agenda items. For example, to include all medical faculty (as currently defined in Art. II, Sect. 1) only when issues of direct interest to the medical enterprise are on the agenda. The procedure and definition of such contingency, however, seemed challenging to implement.
- **Faculty Code:** A summary was presented of the meeting held on Dec 6, 2022. The subcommittee received suggestions to study and propose amendments (if necessary) to promotion and tenure procedures, Dean evaluation procedures, and extensions of parental childcare to other family responsibilities (e.g., eldercare leave). Professor (Tarek) El-Ghazawi raised the question of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and what the implications were for potential conflict, specifically related to incumbent adjuncts being given “right of first refusal” for teaching the same class in the future. He asked the question about what if the intent of the department is to remove a particular

adjunct from teaching a given class, particularly if there have been complaints about the teaching. Vice Provost Hammond mentioned that this provision has been in the contract from the beginning; the most recently concluded discussions focused primarily on financial aspects of the contract. She said that in the case that [Tarek] mentioned, there are procedures in place to handle such a situation, including involvement of other faculty and the Dean's Office within the relevant school or college. It was suggested that the CBA should be added as an agenda item to a future meeting of PEAf.

- **CPS representation in the Faculty Senate:** a proposal to draft a resolution was discussed. The consensus seemed to be to invite CPS to elect two Delegates (without voting rights) to the Faculty Senate, one of whom would also serve on the FSEC. A draft resolution would be circulated to the committee shortly and a special meeting will be called, if necessary.

Prof. Orti reported on the status of discussions regarding the FCC, stating that a meeting would be held between the chairs of PEAf and ASPP with members of the current FCC (Chair Kim Roddis).

Closing

- The committee adjourned at approximately 10:55 am.

A RESOLUTION ON TITLE IX TRAINING FOR FACULTY

WHEREAS The university must comply with a wide range of laws, regulations, and policies that govern its various activities;

WHEREAS the George Washington University complies with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972¹ (“Title IX”), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in the university's programs and activities; the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act² (Clery Act), and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act³ (VAWA), which, with Title IX, governs policies related to the university’s response to sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964⁴ (“Title VII”), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in employment; the District of Columbia Human Rights Act⁵; and other applicable law;

WHEREAS The George Washington University is committed to maintaining a positive climate for study and work, in which individuals are judged solely on relevant factors, such as skill and performance, and can pursue their activities in an atmosphere that is free from discrimination, harassment, and violence;

WHEREAS The George Washington University, after consultation with the Faculty Senate, adopted the Title IX Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct Policy (the “Title IX Policy”)⁶, to inform members of the university community about the university's prohibition against sexual harassment and retaliation and also provides information about resources, reporting options, and prompt and equitable resolution options, and the Equal Opportunity, Nondiscrimination, Anti-Harassment and Non-Retaliation Policy (the “EEO Policy”)⁷, to inform members of the university community about the university’s commitment to maintaining a nondiscriminatory, harassment-free, diverse work and education environment and also provides information about resources and reporting options;

WHEREAS Faculty are governed by the Title IX and the EEO Policy;

¹ <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/05/19/2020-10512/nondiscrimination-on-the-basis-of-sex-in-education-programs-or-activities-receiving-federal>

² <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2014-10-20/pdf/2014-24284.pdf>

³ <https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/senate-bill/47>

⁴ <https://www.justice.gov/crt/laws-enforced-employment-litigation-section>

⁵ <https://code.dccouncil.gov/us/dc/council/code/titles/2/chapters/14/>

⁶ <https://compliance.gwu.edu/title-ix-sexual-harassment-and-related-conduct-policy>

⁷ <https://compliance.gwu.edu/equal-opportunity-nondiscrimination-anti-harassment-and-non-retaliation>

WHEREAS Faculty are “Designated Reporters” and as such they are *required by the Title IX Policy to promptly report* any information they learn about suspected or alleged sexual harassment or potential violations of the Title IX Policy to the university’s Title IX Coordinator;

WHEREAS GW’s Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Risk has designed and offers online training sessions on matters defined by the Title IX Policy and the EEO Policy but voluntary training of Faculty has resulted in very low levels of participation;

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

1. That the Senate supports mandatory Title IX/EEO training for all faculty to facilitate and foster a positive climate for study and work across all campuses and to facilitate their obligation as reporters in cases of suspected or alleged Sexual Harassment or potential violations of the Title IX Policy to the university’s Title IX Coordinator.
2. That the Senate supports mandating faculty to refresh and update their Title IX/EEO training ~~annually or~~ every time the Title IX Policy is revised;
3. That the Provost identify effective means for faculty to participate in the Title IX/EEO training ~~that will encourage compliance, understanding that failure to timely take the Title IX/EEO training may subject the violator to disciplinary and/or corrective action, which will depend on the particular circumstances of the violation.~~

Alternative RC 3. ~~That the Senate supports the Provost’s efforts to~~ identify effective means for faculty to participate in the Title IX/EEO training that will encourage compliance, understanding that failure to timely take the Title IX/EEO training may subject the violator to ~~appropriate~~ disciplinary and/or corrective action, which will depend on the particular circumstances of the violation.

Addendum

After the PEAf meeting, the resolution was posted with the agenda for the Senate meeting, eliciting discussion by senators. Two additional amendments were proposed based on input from faculty senators. Both amendments were individually circulated to the PEAf committee members, and a vote was solicited via email. Both amendments were approved by positive votes by the majority of the committee. These two amendments are listed below and were inserted into a substitute resolution that was presented to the Faculty Senate at the December 9 meeting.

RC3: That the Senate recommends that such training contains best practices, is targeted and appropriate for an academic setting, and is limited in scope to matters directly related to Title IX, and that the Provost identify (a) effective means for faculty to participate in the Title IX/EEO training, (b) appropriate times to communicate with faculty about deadlines, and (c) adequate timelines for completing the training.

(last whereas clause) WHEREAS, GW's Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Risk has designed and offers online training sessions on matters defined by the Title IX Policy and the EEO Policy but this resource does not effectively address actions expected for the designated-reporter role faculty have under current policy and is otherwise inappropriate to academic settings, and communication to faculty about the existence of this resource has been ineffective to achieve high levels of participation;

Finally, the resolution was approved by the Senate on Dec. 9 with an additional amendment proposed by Prof. Wirtz (see final version [here](#))



MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL PEAFF MEETING
HELD ON February 21, 2023
VIA ZOOM

Present: Co-Chairs Houghtby-Haddon and Ortí; Professors Abrams, Clayton, Cohen-Cole, Darr, El-Ghazawi, Gastwirth, Glenn, Greishhammer, Koch, Kyriakopoulos, Patel, Warakas, Wasserman, and Whitt.

Absent: Professors Attia Abrams, Anderson, Bhati, Biles, Cseh, Deng, Hovander, Jacobsen, Meier, Munar Robinson, Schwartz, Sen, Stein, and Weitzner.

Special meeting on the Draft Resolution to include **the College of Professional Studies in the Faculty Senate** called to order at 12:02 pm

The only topic of discussion was the draft resolution to include the College of Professional Studies (CPS) in the Faculty Senate.

The discussion began with a question about why CPS Delegates should be prevented from voting in the Senate. The response was related to CPS's restriction that faculty cannot receive tenure; the concern has been expressed repeatedly in the Senate that the lack of tenure could place undue pressure on the CPS delegates to vote in a way favorable to the administration rather than their own conscience. Providing the CPS delegates with voice but no vote in the Senate meetings is seen as a compromise.

Another question was raised about why not exempt CPS from the tenure requirement for members of the Senate, as is the case with members of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, but part of provision for the non-tenured Senators from SMHS is that at least half of the elected Senators must have tenure. The tenure exemption for SMHS does, as noted in one of the Whereas clauses, open the door for CPS faculty to be elected as well.

A suggestion was made to include CPS faculty under a different school, but the point is that CPS is a separate degree-granting academic unit of the University along with the other nine schools and colleges already on the Senate; to be moved under the auspices of another school would be worse than the current situation.

A suggestion was made to revisit full voting rights five years after the resolution is adopted and the language of the revised Faculty Organization Plan is approved by the Board of Trustees. After some discussion, a motion was made by Professor Clayton, Seconded by Professors Greishhammer, Abrams, and Wasserman that full voting rights for the CPS Faculty be revised within 3 years.

A second-degree amendment was proposed by Prof. Cohen-Cole to include looking at the apportionment of senators among the schools and colleges that are members of the Faculty Senate to have a more equitable distribution. After discussion, the amendment was withdrawn. With the withdrawal of the amendment to the amendment, there was a further brief discussion of the amendment to add language to the FOP that full voting rights for CPS faculty be reviewed within 3 years. The Amendment was approved.

Prof. Greishammer moved, and Professors Patel, Abrams, and Wasserman seconded that the resolution as amended be adopted. The motion was passed unanimously.

Prof. Orti reminded the group that the Committee still has outstanding business from the Charge received from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) for the year, which includes the membership of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), the status of classroom recordings, and the composition and quorum of the Faculty Assembly. These matters will be taken up at the regular meeting of the PEAf committee,

Closing

- The committee adjourned at approximately 1:00 pm.



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PEAFF MEETING
HELD ON March 6, 2023
VIA ZOOM

Present: Co-Chairs Houghtby-Haddon and Ortí; Vice Provost Hammond; Professors Abrams, Bhati, Cohen-Cole, El-Ghazawi, Gastwirth, Glenn, Hovander, Jacobsen, Koch, Patel, Schwartz, Stein, Waraksa, Wasserman, Weitzner, and Whitt.

Absent: Professors Attia, Anderson, , Biles, Clayton, Cseh, Darr, Deng, Griesshammer, Kyriakopoulos, Meier, Munar, Robinson, and Sen.

1. Meeting called to order at 9:55 am

2. **Minutes** of previous meeting (02/06/2023 and 02/21/2023) were approved.

3. Subcommittee updates

- **CPS** participation in the Faculty Senate: our proposed resolution (23/8) made it to the agenda for the March 10 Senate meeting. But we were asked (by FSEC) if it would be acceptable to postpone treatment by the Senate until the April 14 meeting. The agenda for March is overloaded and many senators may not be present due to the Spring break. This delay would give us more time to ‘talk to your senator’ to lobby for this resolution.
- **Faculty Code** revisions: no progress on this front, but this may be the topic of our next regular meeting, assuming the subcommittee may be able to present some recommendations.
- **Faculty Consultative Committee:** a summary was presented of the meeting held by PEAFF and ASPP chairs (Orti and Gupta) with Prof. Kim Roddis (former FCC chair) to discuss the experience and functions of the FCC during the most recent presidential search. The main take-aways from this meeting were that ‘time is of the essence’ (i.e., appointing the FCC as early as possible) and keeping the membership of FCC within bounds to avoid compromising its functioning. Given this size-constraint recommendation, having more than one representative per school may be problematic. More discussion of the topic seems necessary and future meetings may be devoted to it, perhaps inviting guests from previous FCCs.

Classroom Recordings: The documents attached to the agenda were discussed. Vice Provost Hammond explained the terms of ownership, Intellectual Property, and use of recordings by the Administration (e.g., Faculty own IP and have rights to decide how GW distributes, copies, displays, or circulates the copy, and GW can’t replicate or distribute classroom recordings without faculty consent). Members of the committee raised several issues of concern, including the possibility that an administration might engage in “fishing expeditions” against a faculty

member with whom it disagreed. Other issues included the reality that digital files can almost always be reconstructed even after they have been deleted, and that, because university servers are typically backed up on a daily basis, electronic versions of files may still be in backups, even if a file is deleted from someone's computer. The processes involving storage, backing-up and deletion of recording files need to be explained to faculty with more clarity (GW has ownership of the physical object or file with the recording). A "policy document" similar to that posted by the Law School (<https://www.law.gwu.edu/class-recording-policy>) but with GW-wide application may be an appropriate way to inform faculty of all the details and nuances related to ownership and use of classroom recordings.

Closing

- The committee adjourned at approximately 10:55 am.



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PEAf MEETING
HELD ON April 3, 2023
VIA ZOOM

Present: Co-Chairs Houghtby-Haddon and Ortí; Professors, Anderson, Clayton, Darr, El-Ghazawi, Gastwirth, Glenn, Griesshammer, Jacobsen, Koch, Munar, Schwartz, Stein, Waraksa, Wasserman, and Whitt.

Absent: Vice Provost Hammond; Professors Abrams, Attia, Bhati, Biles, Cohen-Cole, Cseh, Deng, Hovander, Kyriakopoulos, Meier, Patel, Robinson, Sen, and Weitzner.

1. Meeting called to order at 9:55 am
2. **Minutes** of previous meeting (03/2023) were approved.
3. **Faculty Consultative Committee:** In light of recommendations from a meeting held by PEAf and ASPP chairs (Orti and Gupta) with Prof. Kim Roddis (former FCC chair) and the recently confirmed version of this resolution by the ASPP Committee (basically the same as last year's version), the discussion of how to amend this resolution centered on the number of members and their School representation. There was no support in PEAf for the ASPP resolution. What our committee supports (passed by majority vote: 13 yes, 4 abstentions) is a new version pasted below, with the following rationale. We changed the "one-third" to "one-fourth" and the "8 additional" to "6 additional" to be elected by FSEC. The numbers comparing these alternative proposals are shown below as well. The "1-per-school" proposal still is seen as providing inadequate representation, especially for large and diverse schools such as CCAS. Also, giving FSEC the power to name an additional 8 is perceived as undemocratic, concentrating too much power into FSEC's hands (out of 18 total, 8 are elected 'by hand' by FSEC). This model seemed to work for this last search but did not work when LeBlanc was elected (FSEC did a poor job electing representatives, especially almost none from CCAS). Delegating more power to the Schools to elect their own representatives (and away from FSEC) is a more stable strategy to protect the process from idiosyncratic or potentially biased FSECs over time. Process: we certainly need to avoid the *deja vu* and failing strategy of sending two opposing resolutions to the senate. It will only backfire and we will be wasting more time and good will. Also, it was noted that **time is NOT of the essence** to resolve this issue because (we hope) we won't need to have another presidential search for several years, and we need to avoid another unproductive senate debate with two opposing resolutions. We may need to continue to talk about these issues in coordination with ASPP until a consensus emerges that everybody will support.

4. **Academic Freedom:** the committee initiated discussions of this complex issue in light of a recent case at GW where student complaints were filed against a professor. Most felt that the process involved in resolving such cases is not generally known by faculty and that more information needs to be available. Analysis of additional 'case studies' may provide some clarity on what the best practices may be to distinguish valid claims of discrimination or harassment from behavior that is consistent with academic freedom. The short discussion did not reach conclusions or recommendations other than to continue debating this topic in the committee. Resources available at GW (provided by VP Hammond) are listed below:

Guidelines for Academic Freedom (the Faculty Senate endorsed this):

<https://provost.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs626/f/downloads/Resources/Academic%20Freedom%20Guidelines%28ApprovedVersion%29.pdf>

And the [Student Discrimination Report Procedures](#) contain the following text (note it has been in place for some years, despite minor revisions a year ago which PEAFF reviewed):

In accordance with the statement on academic freedom outlined in the Faculty Code, in an academic setting, expression that is reasonably designed or reasonably intended to contribute to academic inquiry, education, scholarly pursuit, or debate on issues of public concern shall not be subject to these Procedures.

The EEO policy contains similar language (as does the Title IX Policy):

Nothing in this policy limits academic freedom, guaranteed by the Faculty Code and the Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities, which is a pre-eminent value of the university. Accordingly, in an academic setting, expression that is reasonably designed or reasonably intended to contribute to academic inquiry, education or debate on issues of public concern does not violate this policy. This policy shall also be interpreted in a manner consistent with the principles of professional responsibility as set forth in the Faculty Code and related university policies and guidelines. <https://compliance.gwu.edu/equal-opportunity-nondiscrimination-anti-harassment-and-non-retaliation>

And of course, Section II of the Faculty Code addresses academic freedom.

Closing

- The committee adjourned at approximately 10:55 am.

Attachments



**A RESOLUTION TO IMPLEMENT A FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE IN
PRESIDENTIAL SEARCHES (xx/x)**

WHEREAS, Section C, subsection 5, of “Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code” states, without further guidance:

“The Faculty Assembly shall elect a committee to advise and consult with the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof in the selection of a President”; and

WHEREAS, In 1986, the Faculty Assembly adopted “A Resolution to Implement Part C.5 of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code*” (FA 86/1), which established procedures for faculty participation in presidential searches and directed each of the Schools then in existence to elect a member-designate for confirmation by the Faculty Assembly to serve on the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC); and

WHEREAS, Modifications to the selection procedures intended to broaden diversity and enhance representativeness have been adopted for the 2017 (FA 17/2) and 2022 (FS 22/2) presidential searches; and

WHEREAS, These resolutions required the Senate to elect additional members to the FCC so that the FCC and Presidential Search Committee include adequate participation among disciplines and faculty rank; and

WHEREAS, Making such modifications permanent for all future presidential searches underscores the Faculty Senate’s unqualified commitment to fundamental principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion,

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

1. Article IV of the Faculty Organization Plan should be amended by striking and replacing Article IV with the following:

“Article IV. The Faculty Consultative Committee

SECTION 1. CREATION OF THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Faculty Senate shall send to the Faculty Assembly for endorsement an elected Faculty Consultative Committee to advise and consult with the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof in the selection of a President:

- {1) No later than four weeks after the announcement of a presidential vacancy, or as soon thereafter as is possible, the Faculty Senate representatives of the nine academic divisions represented on the Senate (to wit: Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, Elliott School of International Affairs, School of Medical and Health Sciences, School of Business, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Law School, Milken Institute School of Public Health, School of Nursing, School of Engineering and Applied Sciences), and a committee of the whole of the College of Professional Studies faculty, shall caucus to nominate to their respective faculties members of those faculties;
- {2) The several faculties shall meet no later than six weeks after the announcement of a presidential vacancy, or as soon thereafter as is possible, to elect member-designate(s) to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) from the slate submitted by their Senate representatives or by nomination and election from the floor;
- {3) The number of elected member-designates from each faculty shall be equal to one-fourth of the number of that faculty's representation in the Faculty Senate, rounded to the next highest number, and shall include one member-designate from the College of Professional Studies;
- {4) The several faculties shall immediately submit the names of persons thus elected to the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC);
- {5) In order to provide broader faculty representation of those with otherwise underrepresented demographic traits or characteristics and with diverse academic disciplines, ranks, and tracks in a timely manner, the FSEC shall select up to six additional candidates, including one member of the FSEC;
- {6) The FSEC Chair shall present the resulting slate of nominees to the Faculty Senate for its confirmation and approval;
- {7) The proposed FCC shall be submitted to the Faculty Assembly for election at a Special Meeting to be called as soon as feasibly possible after confirmation and approval by the Faculty Senate, upon which the confirmed and approved slate of nominees shall be declared elected to serve as members of the FCC;
- {8) Within 3 weeks of the confirmation and approval by the Faculty Assembly, the FCC shall convene upon the initiative of the FSEC Chairman, elect a chair, and provide for record-keeping;

SECTION 2. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ROLE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCESS

- (1) The FCC shall request the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof to accept some or all of its members to serve on the Presidential Search Committee for the duration of the presidential search. In the event that not all members of the FCC are so accepted, the FCC shall, in keeping with the principles set forth in Section 1(5) above, elect from among its members that number designated by the Board to serve on the Search Committee; but the FCC shall retain a separate order of business and confer regularly with those of its members who become active members of the Search Committee;
 - (2) The FCC shall request of the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof that, whether some or all of its members are accepted as full members of the Search Committee:
 - a. The FCC be accorded an active role in defining the criteria which the Search Committee will apply in its consideration of the applicants; and
 - b. The Search Committee give full and judicious consideration to any well-reasoned views which the FCC may express with respect to particular applicants;
 - c. Within constraints imposed by the need for confidentiality, as defined by the Search Committee, the FCC may, at its discretion, make interim reports to the Faculty Senate;
 - d. The duly constituted FCC will be disbanded upon the appointment of a new president.”
2. Section C.5 of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code should be deleted.
 3. Article IV of the Faculty Organization Plan should be renumbered Article V.

Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee
 April 3, 2023.

Rationale in RC3: The proposed amendment makes for an agile FCC, which at the same time provides adequate chances for representation along a host of diversity axes, including different academic experiences. It adds up to 6 members from a pool of diversity candidates for a total of up to 20 members. The 14 “school-designate” members are distributed as follows (compared to proposals):

	<i>this proposal</i>	PEAF proposal	ASPP proposal
CCAS:	3	4	1
SB, SMHS:	2 each	2 each, also for Law, SEAS	1 each
all other schools, incl. CPS:	1 each	1 each	1 each
total	14(+6=20)	17(+8=25)	10(+8=18)

Rationale in RC5: The change keeps the FCC size under control, accounting for the fact that the diversity of experiences is also at least in part addressed by having more school-elected members.



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PEAf MEETING
HELD ON May 1st, 2023
VIA ZOOM

Present: Co-Chair Ortí; Vice Provost Hammond; Professors, Anderson, Clayton, Cohen-Cole, Darr, Gastwirth, Glenn, Hovander, Jacobsen, Koch, Kyriakopoulos, Munar, Schwartz, Stein, Wasserman, and Whitt.

Absent: Professors Abrams, Attia, Bhati, Biles, Cseh, Deng, El-Ghazawi, Griesshammer, Houghtby-Haddon, Meier, Patel, Robinson, Sen, Waraksa, and Weitzner.

1. Meeting called to order at 9:55 am
2. **Minutes** of previous meeting (04/03/2023) were approved.
3. **COI/C Policy Revision:** Documents sent to PEAf by **Associate Vice President and Privacy Officer Dorinda Tucker** on a revision to the Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy for Faculty and Investigators were reviewed by PEAf. The new draft, titled Policy on Outside Interests, Relationships, and Professional Activities, establishes general principles that apply to all GW Employees and subsequent role-specific addendums that outline expectations and requirements specific to a university role (Faculty, Investigators, and Executives). The new draft policy uses modernized language related to conflict of interest and commitment (“COI/C”) best practices, considers the DC Non-Compete and Anti-Moonlighting Law, provides more clear expectations and responsibilities, and simplifies language making it easier for employees to understand expectations. The new draft was built through benchmarking of peer and market-basket institutions and collaboration with the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Office of the General Counsel and incorporates language based on questions, concerns, and requests for additional clarity during the annual disclosure process.
Overall, there were no concerns and everyone thought the changes were appropriate. There was some discussion on the Addendum A: Faculty, especially on the section that deals with books authored by faculty:
 - *In a course taught by a Faculty Member, the assignment of a required textbook they authored, or of intellectual property they prepared, may be perceived as obtaining financial gain for themselves unless an objective review is conducted to determine its appropriateness. Therefore, approval shall be obtained through a departmental or school/college review of the intellectual property in question.*

Some PEAFF members felt that this requirement to seek approval might impinge on Academic Freedom. We understand that this is not a new provision. Some faculty present shared their experience requiring students to use books that they authored. The royalties collected by faculty from sales of books under most circumstances (small to medium-sized courses) are very small (\$10-20). Some even paid their share of royalties back to the students that purchased books! Others said that the GW library carries copies of their books, so this is not an issue. After some discussion, there was no specific suggestion offered by the committee. In response to this concern, AVP Dorinda Stucker offered to tweak the bullet for faculty textbook/IP to **recommended** approval rather than **require** approval, as it is more about the perceived conflict rather than an actual material conflict. This offer came after PEAFF reported their concerns.

4. **Classroom Recordings:** a joint statement was issued by three senate committees that reviewed current practice of this pedagogical tool by faculty (ASPP, EPT, and PEAFF). This statement offers some recommendations (see attachment) and will be presented at the May 2023 Senate Meeting.
5. **Academic Freedom and DEI issues:** the committee felt that this topic deserves more discussion in light of the recent developments at several universities (and our own) to raise awareness and to provide more clarity to faculty about grievance procedures.

Closing

- The committee adjourned at approximately 10:55 am.
-



A RESOLUTION ON TITLE IX TRAINING FOR FACULTY (23/4)

WHEREAS, The university must comply with a wide range of laws, regulations, and policies that govern its various activities;

WHEREAS, the George Washington University complies with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972¹ (“Title IX”), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in the university’s programs and activities; the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act² (Clery Act), and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act³ (VAWA), which, with Title IX, governs policies related to the university’s response to sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964⁴ (“Title VII”), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in employment; the District of Columbia Human Rights Act⁵; and other applicable law;

WHEREAS, The George Washington University is committed to maintaining a positive climate for study and work, in which individuals are judged solely on relevant factors, such as skill and performance, and can pursue their activities in an atmosphere that is free from discrimination, harassment, and violence;

WHEREAS, The George Washington University, after consultation with the Faculty Senate, adopted the Title IX Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct Policy (the “Title IX Policy”)⁶, to inform members of the university community about the university’s prohibition against sexual harassment and retaliation and also provides information about resources, reporting options, and prompt and equitable resolution options, and the Equal Opportunity, Nondiscrimination, Anti-Harassment and Non-Retaliation Policy (the “EEO Policy”)⁷, to inform members of the university community about the university’s commitment to maintaining a nondiscriminatory, harassment-free, diverse work and education environment and also provides information about resources and reporting options;

WHEREAS, Faculty are governed by the Title IX and the EEO Policies;

¹ [Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance](#)

² [Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act](#)

³ [Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act](#)

⁴ [Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964](#)

⁵ [District of Columbia Human Rights Act](#)

⁶ [Title IX Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct Policy](#)

⁷ [Equal Opportunity, Nondiscrimination, Anti-Harassment and Non-Retaliation Policy](#)

WHEREAS, Faculty are “Designated Reporters” and as such they are *required by the Title IX Policy to promptly report* any information they learn about suspected or alleged sexual harassment or potential violations of the Title IX Policy to the university’s Title IX Coordinator; and

WHEREAS, GW’s Office of Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement has designed and offers online training sessions on matters defined by the Title IX Policy and the EEO Policy but this resource does not effectively address actions expected for the designated-reporter role faculty have under current policy and is otherwise inappropriate to academic settings, and communication to faculty about the existence of this resource has been ineffective to achieve high levels of participation;

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

1. That the Senate supports mandatory Title IX/EEO training for all faculty to facilitate and foster a positive climate for study and work across all campuses and to facilitate their obligation as reporters in cases of suspected or alleged sexual harassment or potential violations of the Title IX Policy to the university’s Title IX Coordinator;
2. That the Senate supports mandating faculty to refresh and update their Title IX/EEO training every time the Title IX Policy is revised;
3. That the Senate recommends that such training contain best practices, is targeted and appropriate for an academic setting, and is limited in scope to matters directly related to Title IX, and that the Provost identify (a) effective means for faculty to participate in the Title IX/EEO training, (b) appropriate times to communicate with faculty about deadlines, and (c) adequate timelines for completing the training; and
4. That any training mandated under this resolution be first reviewed and endorsed by the Faculty Senate or by a Senate committee designated by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee
December 1, 2022
Revised December 8, 2022
Adopted as amended December 9, 2022



Faculty Senate

A RESOLUTION ON RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE *FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN* (23/6)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee charged the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee to review the Faculty Organization Plan;

WHEREAS, the COVID-19 pandemic has required us to reconsider in-person meetings of the Faculty Assembly and to consider possible alternatives that would allow virtual participation and voting;

WHEREAS, rules are required to establish the procedures for deciding whether a Faculty Assembly meeting should be conducted virtually;

WHEREAS, the titles of several University administrators have changed;

WHEREAS, the function of administering Faculty Assembly meetings now rests with the Faculty Senate Office, which provides notice of meeting by electronic, rather than regular, mail; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan should be free of gender bias;

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

- (1) That the Faculty Organization Plan be amended as set forth on Exhibit A attached to this Resolution, conditional upon the adoption of such amendments by the Faculty Assembly.
- (2) That the President, as Chair of the Faculty Assembly, is petitioned to place on the agenda for the next meeting of the Faculty Assembly a resolution to adopt the amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan set forth on Exhibit A attached to this Resolution.
- (3) That, upon adoption by the Faculty Assembly, the President is requested to forward those amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan for final approval by the Board of Trustees.
- (4) That the Faculty Senate respectfully urges the Board of Trustees not to approve any changes to the Faculty Organization Plan that are different from the amendments adopted by the Faculty Assembly without further consultation with the Faculty Senate and concurrence by the Faculty Assembly in keeping with the University's unbroken tradition of collaborative shared governance.

Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee
January 26, 2023

Adopted by the Faculty Senate
February 3, 2023

EXHIBIT A

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN

Originally put in operation in 1960; as amended most recently in 2023.

Article I. Purpose and Power

SECTION 1. OBJECTIVE

The objective of the Faculty Organization Plan is to enable the Faculty of The George Washington University, in keeping with sound principles of university organization and shared governance, to perform effectively its functions and responsibilities with respect to educational policy and objectives of the University and related matters in which the faculty has a legitimate concern or interest. The provisions of the Plan shall be interpreted and applied in accordance with the stated objective of the Plan.

SECTION 2. STRUCTURES AND POWER

The Faculty Organization shall consist of two bodies: the Faculty Assembly (hereafter "Assembly"), which shall consist of academic personnel holding the rank of university professor, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor who are in full-time service and the administrative personnel provided for hereafter; and the Faculty Senate (hereafter "Senate"), which shall be a representative body acting for the Faculty as the whole in legislative and advisory capacities. The powers, duties, and privileges of the Assembly and Senate shall be exercised in accordance with the Charter of the University and subject to the authority of the Board of Trustees, and they shall relate to matters that are of concern to more than one college, school, or division, or to the Faculty.

Article II. The Faculty Assembly

SECTION 1. MEMBERSHIP

The Faculty Assembly shall consist of the academic personnel holding the rank of university professor, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor who are full-time employees (or, in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the equivalent as defined in affiliation agreements) of a degree-granting college, school, or division of the University. The Faculty Assembly shall further consist of the President, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Executive Vice President for Financial Affairs and Chief Financial Officer, the Dean of Libraries and Academic Innovation, the Registrar, the Dean of Undergraduate Admissions, and the officers of the administration appointed by the President to the Senate. Vice Provosts, other academic personnel in full-time service, and professors and associate professors emeriti, may attend meetings of the Assembly and shall be privileged to speak; but they shall not have the right to make motions or to vote.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Centered

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 0

Deleted: affairs

Deleted:

Deleted: and

Deleted: Treasurer

Deleted: University

Deleted: an,

Deleted: irector of

Deleted: presidents and

SECTION 2. OFFICERS

The President shall be Chair of the Assembly, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be the Vice Chair, and the Registrar shall be the Secretary.

SECTION 3. MEETINGS

(a) A regular meeting of the Assembly shall be held at least once during the academic year.¹ A regular meeting may be called by the President, by the Senate, or by the petition of twenty or more members of the Assembly. The agenda shall be prepared by the President and shall include any matter requested by the Senate or the Executive Committee of the Senate. The agenda shall also include any matter requested by petition of fifteen or more members of the Assembly. The call of a regular meeting shall contain the time, place (in-person, virtual, or both), and agenda of the meeting; and it shall be distributed not later than the tenth day preceding the day of the meeting.

(b) A special meeting of the Assembly may be called by the President (or in the President's absence, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs), by the Chair of the Executive Committee of the Senate, or by either of these at the request of fifty or more members of the Assembly, giving as much notice as the circumstances permit. The agenda for a special meeting shall be prepared by the person calling the meeting, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Senate as far as practicable and, if applicable, with representatives of the members of the Assembly requesting such a special meeting.

(c) The President, or in the President's absence, the Provost, in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, may determine that a regular or special meeting of the Assembly is to be conducted virtually by electronic means in lieu of or in addition to meeting in-person.

(d) A quorum for any meeting shall consist of 125 members of the membership of the Assembly.

(e) The Assembly shall act by affirmative vote of a majority of members present and voting, unless the action proposed is to review action taken by the Senate, in which case the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members present and voting shall be required. Whenever a regular or special Assembly meeting is called at which virtual attendance is permitted, either exclusively or as an alternative to in-person attendance, members of the Assembly who are present in-person or virtually shall be deemed present for purpose of counting the quorum and shall be permitted to vote.

Deleted: (

Deleted: man

Deleted: man

Deleted: request of

Deleted:

Deleted: ; and

Deleted: t

Deleted: as

Deleted: , or

Deleted: mailed

Deleted: or

Deleted: man

Deleted: in the absence of the President by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, or

Deleted: any

Deleted:

Deleted: for any time and place,

Deleted: ir

Deleted:

Deleted: in adverse

Deleted:

Deleted: of

Deleted: ,

Deleted: or one representing a majority of the membership of the Assembly, whichever is the lesser, shall be required

Deleted: .

Deleted:

Deleted: present

Deleted: —in accordance with the criteria announced for that meeting—

Deleted: s

Deleted: ing

¹ Amendment by action of the University's Board of Trustees, March 21, 1991

(f) ~~To the extent possible, the votes of members of the Assembly are public. The votes of individual members may not be recorded in the minutes of the Assembly.~~

(g) The bylaws and rules of procedure of the Assembly shall be subject to the provisions hereof and shall be prepared by the Executive Committee of the Senate, subject to confirmation and amendment by the assembly.

SECTION 4. FUNCTIONS

The functions of the Assembly shall be to:

- (1) Receive information from the President, and such members of the University administration as ~~the~~ President may designate, of matters of general University interest or faculty concern.
- (2) Receive reports from the Senate as to action it has taken and the activities of its committees, and, to the extent then anticipated, its proposed agenda and committee programs for the future. The Assembly shall have the power to direct the Senate to include in the agenda of the Senate or any of its committees, or to study and report back to the Assembly, or to take such other action as may be appropriate with respect to any matter of concern to the Assembly. The Assembly shall also have the power to review any action taken by the Senate and take such action on the basis thereof as the Assembly may deem appropriate.
- (3) Act as a referendum body on questions referred to it for that purpose by the Senate.

Article III. The Faculty Senate

SECTION 1. FUNCTIONS

The Faculty Senate, on behalf of the Faculty, shall, with respect to matters that are of concern to more than one college, school, or division, or to the Faculty:

- (1) Formulate principles and objectives and find facts, so as to recommend policies to the President;
- (2) Provide the President and the Board of Trustees with advice and counsel on such matters as they may request;
- (3) At the direction of the Assembly — or may, at the request of the faculty of any college, school, division or of individual faculty members, or on its own initiative — consider any matters of concern or interest to more than one college, school, or division, or to the Faculty, and make its recommendations or otherwise express its opinion with respect thereto, to the Assembly, the President, or ~~to~~ the Board of Trustees;

Deleted: through the President

(4) Be the Faculty agency to which the President initially presents information and which the President consults concerning proposed changes in existing policies or promulgation of new policies.

SECTION 2. ORGANIZATION

(a) *Membership*

(1) The President shall be a member of the Senate ex officio, and the President or, in the President's absence, the Provost as presiding officer may vote to break a tie vote.

Deleted: alternative nother

Deleted:

(2) Persons who are otherwise eligible for election to and service in the Senate shall be members of the University and shall not be in a probationary status. Questions of eligibility for election and service shall be determined by the Senate.

(3) The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: The Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, 11 seats; the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, 3 seats; the School of Engineering and Applied Science, 4 seats; The School of Business, 5 seats; the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, 5 seats; the Law School, 4 seats; the Elliott School of International Affairs, 3 seats; the School of Public Health, 3 seats; and the School of Nursing, 2 seats. The faculty members eligible for election shall be professors, associate professors, or assistant professors in full-time service who have tenure as of the academic year succeeding the date of election. Vice presidents, assistant vice presidents, deans, associate deans, assistant deans, and other faculty members whose duties are primarily administrative in nature shall be ineligible for election as faculty members of the Senate.²

Deleted: and Health Services

Exemptions to the foregoing rule regarding eligibility for service as a faculty member of the Senate are provided for the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, to the extent that, from that school only, Regular Faculty with non-tenure-track appointments shall be eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, provided that such Regular Faculty shall have completed at least three years of full-time service to the University and shall have attained the rank of Associate Professor or higher, and provided further, that at least half of the faculty members of the Senate from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, shall be tenured faculty members.

Deleted:

Deleted: and the S

Deleted: school of Nursing

Deleted: ose two

Deleted:

Deleted: s

Deleted: each of those two schools

Deleted: The foregoing exemption for the School of Nursing shall expire three years after the approval of that exemption by the Faculty Assembly and the University's Board of Trustees.³

(4) The administrative members of the Senate shall consist of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Registrar, and a number of officers of administration equal to the number of degree-granting colleges, schools, and divisions. Administrative members shall have the right to debate but not to make motions or vote. They shall be appointed by the President and shall serve until their successors are appointed, but not for less than one semester unless their service is terminated by separation from the University.

Deleted: shall be

(b) *Officers*

² Amendment by action of the University's Board of Trustees, October 19, 2012, pursuant to Faculty Assembly Resolution FA 12/1

The President shall preside at meetings of the Senate and in President's absence, the order of succession to preside shall be the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The Registrar shall be Secretary of the Senate. The Bylaws may provide for other officers of the Senate.

Deleted: his

Deleted: man

(c) *Terms of Office*

The term of office for faculty members of the Senate shall be two years beginning on May 1 of the year in which they are elected. If necessary, the terms shall be adjusted by the Executive Committee, with the consent of the Senate, so as to elect approximately one-half of the faculty members from each school each year.

SECTION 3. ELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS

The election of faculty members of the Senate shall be held subject to the following requirements but otherwise pursuant to procedures determined by the faculty members eligible to vote in the school or group involved:

- (1) The nominating procedure shall permit nominations from the floor or by petition in addition to any other method adopted by the faculty of the school or group involved, and shall, unless otherwise determined at or prior to the election meeting by two-thirds vote of such faculty, require at least two nominees for each Senate seat to be filled.
- (2) Voting shall be by secret ballot.
- (3) Only members of the faculty in full-time service shall be eligible to vote.
- (4) The elections shall be held at meetings called by the academic deans of the respective schools prior to March 15 of each year. A quorum shall be that number which is determined by the faculty of the individual school, college, or division as the quorum required for its regular faculty meetings.
- (5) In the event that a vacancy occurs in the Senate membership or a member is on leave of absence or otherwise unable to participate for any period, the faculty of the school or group involved shall be entitled to elect another representative for the remainder of the term or pro tempore for the period of absence involved.

SECTION 4. MEETINGS

(a) Regular meetings of the Senate shall be held at stated intervals as determined by it but no less often than twice during each semester of the academic year. Special meetings shall be called by the President, acting on the President's own initiative, upon request of the Executive Committee or the Assembly, or by petition of 25 percent of the elected members of the Senate. The Chair of the Executive Committee in consultation with the President shall determine whether a regular or special meeting is to be conducted in-person, virtually, or both.

Deleted: may

Deleted: his

Deleted:

Deleted: or

Deleted: the

(b) A quorum shall consist of the next whole number greater than one-half of the faculty members. All power of the Senate shall be exercised by the affirmative vote of a majority of the faculty members present and voting, except where the Bylaws require an extraordinary majority for particular business. ~~Faculty members who attend regular meetings virtually when permitted are to be counted toward the quorum and may vote electronically.~~

(c) The agenda for any meeting shall be made available in writing ~~by the Senate Office~~, to all members of the Senate at least seven days prior to the meeting in the case of regular meetings, and with the call in the case of special meetings, and shall be made available for inspection by all members of the Assembly. If, at any regular meeting, any item of business is deemed sufficiently urgent by a majority of the faculty members of the Senate, or by two-thirds of the faculty members present and voting, whichever is the greater, action may be taken with regard thereto by the Senate at such meeting without its previous inclusion in the agenda.

(d) A summary of the minutes of each meeting shall be furnished ~~by the Senate Office by the Secretary of the Senate~~ to all members of the Assembly and such administrative officers as the President shall designate. A copy of the full minutes shall be made available ~~by the Senate Office by the Secretary~~ for inspection by any such member or officer.

(e) Except as otherwise provided herein, or required by the Assembly, the Senate may adopt such bylaws and other rules concerning its government and procedures as it considers appropriate.

SECTION 5. COMMITTEES

(a) General

There shall be three kinds of Senate Committees: the Executive Committee, standing committees, and special committees. The Executive Committee and all standing committees shall meet as directed by the Senate or as determined necessary by the committees themselves or their chairs, but not less than once a year. Committee meetings shall be conducted according to orderly procedure, records of deliberations shall be kept, and reports shall be made to the Senate as often as required, but at least annually. Copies of all formal reports shall be filed with the ~~Senate Office~~, and shall be available for inspection by members of the Assembly and the administrative officers of the University. Members of the Executive Committee and standing committees shall be elected for a term not exceeding one year. ~~Members~~ of the Executive Committee shall ~~not~~ immediately succeed ~~themselves~~ more than twice. The Senate shall establish such procedures for temporary replacement of members of the Executive Committee as shall seem necessary to assure that the Executive Committee would not be prevented from acting effectively in emergencies because of inability to assemble a quorum of its membership.

(b) The Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall consist of nine faculty members of the Senate. ~~The President and Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs serve~~ ex officio. The following nine schools shall have one representative each: the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, the Elliott School of International Affairs, the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, the

Deleted: by the Secretary of the Senate

Deleted: men

Deleted: Secretary

Deleted: No m

Deleted: him

Deleted: f

Deleted: and t

Law School, the School of Business, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the School of Nursing, and the School of Public Health.⁴ Any faculty member of the Senate shall be eligible to be elected to the Executive Committee.

Deleted: Services

At the first meeting of each Senate session, the first agenda item shall be the election of a new Executive Committee. At that first meeting, the Chair shall first be elected by the Senate and the Senate shall also elect the other eight elective members of the Executive Committee, subject to the restriction that no two members of the Executive Committee shall be elected to the Senate by the same school or faculty group. If at any time the Chair of the Executive Committee or any other voting member of the Executive Committee is unable to serve temporarily or indefinitely, the Executive Committee shall elect a replacement or replacements to serve until the next regular meeting of the Senate, at which time the Senate shall elect a replacement or replacements to serve for the remainder of the term of the Executive Committee or pro tempore for the period of absence involved. The term of the Executive Committee shall begin upon election at the first meeting of the Senate session and last until the election of the subsequent Executive Committee. The Committee shall:

Deleted: T

Deleted: man

Deleted: ;

Deleted: have been

Deleted: man

- (1) Arrange the agenda for Senate meetings, and shall serve as the channel through which any member of the Assembly may introduce matters for the consideration of the Senate. It shall include in the agenda for any meeting any matters requested by the President or by 20 percent of the members of the Senate.
- (2) Serve as the committee on committees for the Senate and in that capacity nominate the members and chairs of the standing and special committees and the nominating committee for the members and Chair of the Executive Committee. Individual faculty members of the Senate shall have the right to make additional nominations, by petition to the Executive Committee or nominating committee prior to the election meeting, or from the floor at such meeting. In the event of any questions or dispute as to the jurisdiction of any standing or special committee, the matter shall be referred to the Executive Committee for resolution.
- (3) Assist in carrying into effect the actions of the Assembly and the Senate, and make regular progress reports with respect thereto to the Senate.
- (4) Prepare and submit progress reports and reports on the work of the Senate, and on any other matter directed by the Senate, to the President and to the Assembly. ~~At the end of e~~ Each academic year, a report covering the entire year shall be prepared and distributed to all members of the Assembly.
- (5) Receive reports prepared by or in any college, school, or division of the University that may be of concern or interest to any other college, school, or division, or to the faculty generally, and arrange for distribution of copies thereof to such other college, school, or division or the faculty.

Deleted: men

Deleted: man

⁴ Amendment by action of the Board of Trustees, October 2011, pursuant to Faculty Assembly Resolution FA 11/1

- (6) Act on behalf of the Senate in emergencies on matters requiring immediate action when it is not feasible to call a special meeting of the Senate, such action to be reported to the Senate for confirmation at its next regular meeting.

(c) Other Committees

- (1) The committees of the Senate shall have power to inquire, hear, deliberate, advise, assist, and administer, and to receive and propose resolutions regarding all matters within the functions of the Senate set out in Section 1 of this Article. Advice given and action taken by Senate committees shall be reported to the Senate annually, or as otherwise required by the Senate.
- (2) The name, membership, scope, and duties of each standing committee of the Senate shall be set down in the Senate Bylaws. The majority of voting members of every standing committee shall be members of the Faculty in full-time service. Special committees may be established by the Senate, and subcommittees may be established by the Senate or by its committees, and special committees and subcommittees shall be composed of such members as the Senate or its committees may provide. The chair of every standing committee and subcommittee shall include at least one faculty member of the Senate.
- (3) The Senate may elect any person to membership in any Senate committee. The President may appoint to nonvoting membership in any standing or special Senate committee any officer of administration whose duties fall within the committee's scope.

Deleted: man

Article IV. Amendments

Amendments to this University Faculty Organization Plan may be proposed to the Assembly by the President, by the Senate through petition to the President as Chair of the Assembly, or by 100 of the faculty members of the Assembly. Voting on a proposed amendment by the Assembly may be at a regular or special meeting. For adoption of a proposed amendment by the Assembly, a favorable vote of either two-thirds of those voting, or a majority of the voting members of the Assembly, whichever is the lesser, shall be required. Amendments so adopted shall be submitted to the Board of Trustees for its approval and shall become effective only when so approved.

Deleted: man

Deleted: |

APPENDIX I

Rules of Procedure for Faculty Assembly Meetings

1. NOTICE OF MEETING. Notice of a meeting of the Assembly shall consist of the time, place and form of the meeting, the type of meeting, whether regular or special, the means by which the meeting has been called, and the Agenda prepared by the President. The Senate Office shall publish the Notice at least ten days (not including the meeting day) prior to the meeting day.

Deleted: and

2. PRESIDING OFFICER. The President shall be Chair of the Assembly and its presiding officer. In absence of the President, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs shall preside, and in the Provost's absence, the Chair of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Deleted: ; and t

Deleted: ecretary

Deleted: t

Deleted: in the University mail

Deleted:

Deleted: man

Deleted: their

Deleted: his

Deleted: man

Deleted: man

3. ORDER OF BUSINESS. The ordering of business on the Agenda shall be done by the President, and matters may be taken up out of the announced order at the Chair's discretion. A matter for debate that does not appear in the Agenda may be taken up only by a majority vote suspending the Rules of Procedure for that matter.

4. MEETINGS. Attendance at meetings of the Assembly shall be confined to members, except as individuals are invited by the President or Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to attend, and subject to the Assembly's right to declare the meeting closed to nonmembers by a majority vote.

5. DEBATE. Debate and amendments (including substitute motions) must be germane to the question being debated. In order to raise the issue of germaneness, a member may interrupt debate to call for a ruling by the Chair, or the Chair may raise the issue; and the Chair's ruling on germaneness may be overturned by a majority vote.

Deleted: man

Deleted: man

Deleted:

Deleted: themhimself

Deleted: man

Deleted: man

6. RULES OF ORDER. Except as otherwise specified in the Rules of Procedure, the Assembly shall govern itself according to Robert's Rules of Order. The Parliamentarian of the Senate shall advise the Chair on points of order.

7. VOTING. The first vote on a question shall normally be by voice, and if members attend virtually, by equivalent electronic means, and the Chair shall announce the result. If the Chair or three members call for a division of the Assembly, the Chair shall appoint tellers and shall call for a show of hands, or an equivalent electronic and public method for any members attending virtually, announcing the number of affirmative and negative votes. No secret ballot shall be taken except by notice in the Agenda.

Deleted: man

Deleted: man

Deleted: man

8. ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT. The Rules of Procedure, having been prepared by the Executive Committee of the Senate according to Article II, Section 3(e), of the Faculty Organization Plan, may be adopted by the Assembly by majority vote. The Rules may thereafter be amended as an ordinary matter of business after appearing on the Agenda and being adopted by majority vote.

APPENDIX II

Bylaws of the Faculty Senate

Be It Resolved by the Faculty Senate of The George Washington University:

SECTION 1. MEETINGS AND SESSIONS

(a) A “regular meeting” of the Senate shall be held on the second Friday of September, October, November, December, January, February, March, April, and May. The Executive Committee may change the date of a regular meeting in unusual circumstances. The Executive Committee may cancel any regular meeting for which there is not sufficient business. In urgent circumstances, the Executive Committee may determine that additional Regular Meetings are needed in shorter intervals and may act to arrange such Regular Meetings during each semester of the academic year or during the summer. The President may call a “special meeting” upon request of the Executive Committee or upon petition of 25 percent of the elected members of the Senate.

(b) Meetings of the Senate shall be open for attendance and observation to all members of the Faculty Assembly, except that by a majority vote the Senate may declare an “executive session,” which only elected and ex officio members may attend.

(c) The business year of the Senate shall be called a “session” and each session shall commence with the call to order of the regular meeting in May.

SECTION 2. ORDER OF BUSINESS AND AGENDA

(a) The order of business for regular meetings of the Senate shall be as follows:

- (1) Call to order
- (2) Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting
- (3) Special business; for example, matters postponed to this meeting
- (4) Resolutions reported out of Committees, with reports if any
- (5) Resolutions
- (6) General business; for example, announcements, nominations, elections, appointments, and Committee reports unaccompanied by Resolutions
- (7) Brief Statements
- (8) Adjournment

(b) The minutes of the previous meeting shall not be read aloud prior to their approval if written copies have been previously circulated to members of the Senate, unless the Senate shall by majority vote, without debate, order them to be read.

(c) The Executive Committee shall include in the Agenda for any meeting any matters requested by the President or by 20 percent of the members of the Senate. Arrangement of the Senate's business upon the Agenda within the above categories shall be the duty of the Executive Committee. Matters on the Agenda may be taken up out of order by a majority vote.

(d) The Agenda for a regular meeting shall be available to members in writing on the Senate's website, and a link to that Agenda shall be sent to all members on or before the seventh day before the meeting day.⁵

(e) The Agenda for a regular meeting shall be accompanied by copies of reported Resolutions scheduled for debate, including those that originate in Committees and have not theretofore been introduced, and copies of Committee Reports submitted with Resolutions. If, at any regular meeting, any items of business is deemed sufficiently urgent by a majority of the faculty members of the Senate, or by two-thirds of the faculty members present and voting, whichever is the greater, action may be taken with regard thereto by the Senate at such meeting without its previous inclusion in the Agenda.

(f) The Agenda for a special meeting shall be prepared by the Executive Committee and may be incorporated in the call for the meeting. The minutes of a special meeting shall be approved at the next regular meeting. No Resolution, nor any items of business, not on the Agenda for the special meeting shall be considered by the Senate.

(g) The Senate should normally convene at 2pm and adjourn at 4:30pm. A motion to adjourn, if offered, shall require a majority vote as usual. It is the sense of the Senate that members should have a reasonable advance expectation of the latest time that a Senate meeting will adjourn so that members can plan other activities. Members should keep the time of the day in mind in framing their remarks.⁶

SECTION 3. RESOLUTIONS

(a) A "Resolution" shall consist of a statement that, if adopted by the Senate, will announce the policy of the Senate with regard to some matter within its competence.

(b) A Resolution shall consist of these parts: the Title, the Preamble (if any), the Resolving Clause, and the Text. The Title shall briefly describe the content and purpose of the Resolution, which should be confined to a single topic; the Title shall commence, "A Resolution to (or for)..." The Preamble, if any, shall describe the background of the Resolution. Following the Preamble, if any, and immediately preceding the Text shall appear this Resolving Clause: "Be It Resolved by the Faculty Senate of The George Washington

⁵ Amended by Faculty Senate Resolution 20/11.

⁶ Amended by Faculty Senate Resolution 20/11.

University.” The Text may set forth more than one policy, each policy begin stated in a separate numbered section.

(c) In order to “introduce” a Resolution, a member shall read its Title and move its adoption, another member shall second the motion, and the first member shall present one copy to the presiding officer and one copy to the Secretary. The presiding officer shall then read the Resolution aloud and refer it to the Chair of the Executive Committee for assignment to an appropriate Committee. Resolutions shall be numbered by the Secretary consecutively in the order of their introduction or reported as original Resolutions from Committees; for example, “Resolution No. 66-5”; and Resolutions may be referred to by number in the Minutes, in Reports, and in debate.

Deleted: man

(d) The presiding officer shall declare a Resolution “adopted” by the Senate upon passage of its Resolving Clause and Text by a majority vote.

SECTION 4. COMMITTEE ACTION ON RESOLUTIONS

(a) A Resolution introduced at a meeting shall be assigned by the Chairman of the Executive Committee to an appropriate Standing Committee or to the Special Committee created by motion for the purpose. Resolutions may also be originated by Committees without prior introduction in a Senate meeting, and such Resolutions need only be reported by the Committee to become the business of the Senate. A Resolution that is assigned to a Standing Committee and is neither reported during the session nor attached to a Standing Committee’s Annual Report shall be listed by the Executive Committee’s Annual Report as “defeated in Committee,” and the Resolution must be reintroduced or originated in a Committee in order to be taken up in a subsequent session. Resolutions assigned to Special Committees shall survive from session to session without Committee action.

(b) A Resolution shall be “reported” to the Senate for its action when the Committee’s chair presents a copy of the Resolution to the Chair of the Executive Committee for inclusion on the Agenda. A Special Report of the Committee may accompany the Resolution.

Deleted: man

Deleted: man

SECTION 5. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) Committee reports shall be of three kinds: Annual Reports, Final Reports, and Special Reports.

(1) Each Standing Committee and the Executive Committee shall submit an “Annual Report” of activities during the session. Resolutions attached to an Annual Report shall be the business of the Committee in the next session, and with the consent of the Committee’s Chair, the Resolutions may be put upon the Agenda of any meeting in the next session.

Deleted: man

(2) Each Committee shall submit a “Final Report” to the Senate at the conclusion of its activities and shall, with submission of the Final Report, move to be discharged.

(3) A “Special Report” may be submitted by any Committee at any time, either in support of its reporting a Resolution, or by way of information to the Senate on the Committee’s activities.

(b) A Committee Report must be adopted by a majority of the Committee and shall be submitted over the name of the Chair, whether they concurs in the Report or not. The Chair and members of the Committee may submit their separate views for attachment to the Committee Report over their separate names. A Committee Report shall be “submitted” when it is delivered in writing to the Chair of the Executive Committee. Each Committee Report more than three double-spaced typewritten pages in length shall commence with a “Summary” not more than one such page in length for distribution to the Faculty Assembly.

Deleted: man

Deleted: man

Deleted: man

(c) The submitted Committee Report shall be circulated to the members of the Senate and shall be included in the minutes at the next appropriate meeting, but it shall not be read aloud unless requested by a majority vote. No Senate action regarding a Committee Report as such shall be in order, whether to receive, adopt, or accept it. The appropriate manner of securing debate and adoption of a Committee’s proposals shall be to frame them as Resolutions.

SECTION 6. VOTING

(a) Elected members of the Senate shall be the voting members, except as provided below to break a tie vote.

(b) A “majority vote” shall be one vote more than one-half of the elected members present and voting, and “quorum” shall consist of one-half of the elected members; and if “one-half” equals a fraction, the number required for a majority vote or a quorum shall be the next higher whole number.

(c) Voting shall ordinarily be by voice, and/or as appropriate by equivalent electronic means with the presiding officer calling for the Ayes and Nays and declaring the result; except that any member, elected or ex officio, may call for a division of the Senate.

(d) Voting in a division of the Senate shall ordinarily be by show of hands, and/or as appropriate by equivalent electronic means with the presiding officer appointing nonvoting tellers and announcing the Ayes and Nays. In a division of the Senate the presiding officer may, when they announce a tie vote, vote orally to break the tie vote.

Deleted: s

(e) Upon the call of six elected members a roll call vote shall be taken. The Secretary shall call the roll alphabetically, recording beside each name “Aye,” “Nay,” “Not Voting,” or “Absent,” and the presiding officer shall vote last and only if they wish to break a tie vote between the Ayes and the Nays. The presiding officer shall announce all the results of a roll-call vote.

Deleted: es

(f) By a majority vote a secret ballot may be taken. The Secretary as teller shall record the Ayes and the Nays and inform the presiding officer, who shall announce them; and if there is a tie vote between the Ayes and the Nays, the presiding officer, if an ex officio member, may vote orally to break the tie.

SECTION 7. DEBATE

(a) The entry of a Resolution upon the Agenda as reported by a Committee puts that business before the Senate for debate, and no second or other motion is required. A spokesperson for the position of the Committee, ordinarily the Chair, shall have the privilege of opening and closing debate on the merits.

Deleted: man
Deleted: man

(b) Debate and amendments must be germane to the Resolution or other motions, and rulings of the presiding officer upon calls for order of the question of the germaneness shall be appealable by a majority vote.

(c) Upon request of an elected member, and upon a majority vote if demanded by any member, the privileges of the floor for a germane statement not to exceed ten minutes in length may be extended to any person.

SECTION 7A. STATEMENTS AND DISCUSSIONS

(a) At the close of all business brought before the Senate at a regular meeting, a member or any other person, within the procedures set out in Section 7(c) may deliver a statement upon any subject within the competence of the Senate, and any other members may join in discussion of the statement. Other statements and discussion may follow. A statement shall not be considered a Resolution, and discussion of a statement shall not be considered debate. The order of appearance of persons delivering statements may be set in advance of the meeting by arrangement with the President and may, but need not, be set forth in the Agenda. The subjects of statements and motions of referral, but not the details of discussion, shall be recorded in the minutes.

(b) A statement or discussion may be interrupted by the following motion: "I move to refer the subject to the Senate Committee on...(naming an appropriate committee)." Because a function of the motion is to terminate discussion of the subject, the motion shall be undebatable, and it shall be amendable only in respect of the committee designated.

Deleted: undebateable

SECTION 8. RULES OF ORDER AND PARLIAMENTARIAN

(a) Except as specifically provided to the contrary in the Bylaws, the Senate and its committees shall govern themselves, according to Robert's Rules of Order.

Deleted: itself

(b) A Parliamentarian shall be appointed at the first regular meeting of each session by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Parliamentarian shall not be a member of the Senate. The Parliamentarian shall advise on parliamentary procedure for meetings and shall assist in the drafting of Resolutions.

Deleted: He
Deleted:

(c) Rulings announced by the presiding officer shall govern the Senate unless appealed and overruled by a majority vote. It shall be the duty of the Parliamentarian to frame issues of procedure as proposed amendments to the Bylaws.

SECTION 9. AMENDMENTS

Amendments to the Bylaws may be introduced and referred to the Executive Committee, or they may be originated within the Executive Committee at the suggestion of the Parliamentarian, and they shall be treated as nearly as may be as Resolutions. Enactment shall be by a majority vote. Amendments shall not be considered under a suspension of the rules of order.

SECTION 10. STANDING COMMITTEES

There shall be standing committees for the following areas: Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies; Athletics and Recreation; Educational Policy and Technology; Fiscal Planning and Budgeting; Honors and Academic Convocations; Libraries; Physical Facilities; Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom; Research; and University and Urban Affairs.⁷

Although members of standing committees are elected for terms not exceeding one year, it is the sense of the Senate that a greater degree of continuity and consistency in the transaction of committee business will be assured if elected members consider it an obligation to stand for re-election to the same committee at least once.

All standing committees shall hold at least one meeting at the beginning of each Senate Session.

⁷ Amended by Faculty Senate Resolutions 04/8, 06/2, and 20/4.



A RESOLUTION ON DEFINING REPRESENTATION OF THE COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN THE FACULTY SENATE (23/8)

WHEREAS, the College of Professional Studies (CPS) was established in 2000 as a degree-granting academic unit of the George Washington University;

WHEREAS, over the past 23 years CPS has served non-traditional students and working professionals through both graduate and undergraduate degree programs offered both in person and online, thereby extending a George Washington University education to those who might otherwise not be able to access one;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate acknowledges the substantial contribution and commitment of the CPS faculty to the educational and scholarly betterment of the University and their exemplary service on Faculty Senate Committees in prominent roles;

WHEREAS, from its establishment the entire College of Professional Studies full-time faculty have been restricted from receiving tenure;

WHEREAS, the members of the Faculty Senate are required by the *Faculty Organization Plan* (Article III. Section 2(a)(3)) to have tenure, thereby preventing the faculty of CPS from serving in the Faculty Senate with the consequence that they are substantially excluded from participating in the shared governance of the university;

WHEREAS, the *Faculty Organization Plan* does make an exception to the tenure requirement for faculty of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (Article III. Section 2(a)(3)), stipulating that “Regular Faculty with non-tenure track appointments shall be eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, provided that such Regular Faculty shall have completed at least three years of full-time service to the University and shall have attained the rank of Associate Professor or higher...”;

WHEREAS, the full-time faculty of CPS are regular full-time faculty, non-tenure track, as defined in Section I.B of the *Faculty Code*, and are eligible to hold the rank of Associate Professor or higher;

WHEREAS, without tenure, CPS faculty may not be protected from undue pressure or influence to vote in a particular way on matters before the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate considers the representation of CPS faculty in the Faculty Senate as important, without voting rights but otherwise with all rights, privileges and responsibilities of Regular Faculty members of the Faculty Senate;

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

- (1) That the *Faculty Organization Plan* be amended as set forth on Exhibit A attached to this Resolution, conditional upon the adoption of such amendments by the Faculty Assembly;
- (2) That the President, as Chair of the Faculty Assembly, is petitioned to place on the agenda for the next meeting of the Faculty Assembly a resolution to adopt the amendments to the *Faculty Organization Plan* set forth on Exhibit A attached to this Resolution;
- (3) That, upon adoption by the Faculty Assembly, the President is requested to forward those amendments to the *Faculty Organization Plan* for final approval by the Board of Trustees, making any technical corrections necessary to make them consistent with the recommendations of Senate Resolution 23/6, if adopted at the same Faculty Assembly; and
- (4) That the Faculty Senate respectfully urges the Board of Trustees not to approve any changes to the *Faculty Organization Plan* that are different from the amendments adopted by the Faculty Assembly without further consultation with the Faculty Senate and concurrence by the Faculty Assembly in keeping with the University's unbroken tradition of collaborative shared governance.

Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee
February 21, 2023

Adopted as amended by the Faculty Senate
April 14, 2023

Exhibit A

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN

Art. III The Faculty Senate

SECTION 2. ORGANIZATION

(a) *Membership*

...

(3) The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: The Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, 11 seats; the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, 3 seats; the School of Engineering and Applied Science, 4 seats; The School of Business, 5 seats; the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, 5 seats; the Law School, 4 seats; the Elliott School of International Affairs, 3 seats; the School of Public Health and Health Services, 3 seats; and the School of Nursing, 2 seats. The faculty members shall be professors, associate professors, or assistant professors in full-time service who have tenure as of the academic year succeeding the date of election. Vice presidents, assistant vice presidents, deans, associate deans, assistant deans, and other faculty members whose duties are primarily administrative in nature shall be ineligible for election as faculty members of the Senate.²

Exemptions to the foregoing rule regarding eligibility for service as a faculty member of the Senate are provided for the School of Medicine and Health Sciences and the School of Nursing, to the extent that, from those two schools only, Regular Faculty with non-tenure-track appointments shall be eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, provided that such Regular Faculty shall have completed at least three years of full-time service to the University and shall have attained the rank of Associate Professor or higher, and provided further, that at least half of the faculty members of the Senate from each of these two school shall be tenured faculty members. The foregoing exemption for the School of Nursing shall expire three years after the approval of that exemption by the Faculty Assembly and the University's Board of Trustees.³

(4) In addition, the College of Professional Studies shall elect two of its faculty members as Delegates. These Delegates shall not have the right to vote in meetings of the Faculty Senate but shall otherwise enjoy all responsibilities, rights, and privileges of regular Faculty Senate members. From this School, any regular faculty with non-tenure-track appointment shall be eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, provided that such Regular Faculty shall have completed at least three years of full-time service to the University and shall have attained the rank of Associate Professor or higher. Their terms of office shall be the same as that of regular members of the Senate, as described in (c). Their election shall follow the same rules as that of regular faculty members of the Senate, as described in Section 3.

~~(4)~~(5) The administrative members of the Senate shall consist of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Registrar, and a number of officers of administration equal to the number of degree-granting colleges, schools, and divisions. Administrative members shall have the right to debate but not to make motions or vote. They shall be appointed by the President and shall serve until their successors shall be appointed, but not less than one semester unless their service is terminated by separation from the University.

...

² Amendment by action of the University's Board of Trustees, October 19, 2012, pursuant to Faculty Assembly Resolution FA 12/1

³ Amendment by action of the University's Board of Trustees, October 2016, pursuant to Faculty Assembly Resolution FA 17/3

SECTION 5. COMMITTEES

...

(b) The Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall consist of nine faculty members of the Senate, ~~one~~ ~~CPS~~ ~~delegate~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Senate~~, and the President ex officio. The following ~~nine~~ ~~ten~~ schools shall have one representative each: the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, the Elliott School of International Affairs, the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, the Law School, the School of Business, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the School of Nursing, ~~the~~ ~~College~~ ~~of~~ ~~Professional~~ ~~Studies~~, and the School of Public Health Services.⁴ Any faculty member of the Senate ~~and~~ ~~one~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~two~~ ~~delegates~~ ~~from~~ ~~CPS~~ shall be eligible to be elected to the Executive Committee. The Chairman shall first be elected by the Senate; the Senate shall also elect the other ~~eight~~ ~~nine~~ elective members of the Executive Committee, subject to the restriction that no two members of the Executive Committee shall have been elected to the Senate by the same school or faculty group. If at any time the Chair of the Executive Committee or any other voting member of the Executive Committee is unable to serve temporarily or indefinitely, the Executive Committee shall elect a replacement or replacements to serve until the next regular meeting of the Senate, at which time the Senate shall elect a replacement or replacements to serve for the remainder of the term of the Executive Committee or pro tempore for the period of absence involved. The Committee shall:

...

APPENDIX II

Bylaws of the Faculty Senate

...

SECTION 6. VOTING

- (a) Elected members of the Senate shall be the voting members, except as provided below to break a tie vote. ~~Delegates of the College of Professional Studies do not have voting rights in regular and special meetings of the Faculty Senate and are not counted towards a quorum. Delegates of the College of Professional Studies shall have voting rights in the Faculty Senate committees on which they serve, including~~ ~~excluding~~ the Executive Committee. The lack of voting rights in regular and special meetings of the Faculty Senate ~~and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee~~ shall be reviewed within three years after seating the first CPS Delegates.

⁴ Amendment by action of the Board of Trustees, October 2011, pursuant to Faculty Assembly Resolution FA 11/1



Faculty Senate

Classroom Recordings Policy Report: Executive Summary and Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Feb. 9, 2023

Contents:

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

Summary of Survey

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

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

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

Faculty Recording Policies

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Faculty Experiences with Recording:

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

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

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

Reasons for Recording:

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

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

Reasons for Not Recording Classes:

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

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

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

CONCLUSIONS FROM SURVEY DATA:

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

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

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

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

1. Copyright of Intellectual Property

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

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

2. Access to recordings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Notes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Question 2: How long does the university keep recordings?

In an email sent to all users on 12/19/22, the following retention plan was defined:

“Video recordings stored in web conferencing tools as of **January 1, 2023**, will be saved for **180 days**. After 180 days, recordings will be moved to the meeting host’s “Trash” folder for an additional **30 days**. Once the 30-day Trash countdown expires, the recordings will be permanently deleted and cannot be recovered. On **June 30, 2023**, all recordings that are older than 180 days will be moved to the meeting host’s “Trash” folder for 30 days. Once the 30-day Trash countdown expires, the recordings will be permanently deleted and cannot be recovered.”



Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Research Committee Standing Committee Annual Report May 21st – April 7th 2023

Members of the committee, Faculty Senate year 2022/23: McDonnell (Co-Chair), Sarkar (Co-Chair), Marotta-Walters (Executive Committee liaison), faculty (voting): Applebaum, Baird, Berg, Bosque-Pardos, Cohen-Cole, Darcy Mahoney, El-Ghazawi, Engel, Entcheva, Jeremic, Joubin, Kay, Kumar, Kusner, Mazhari, Mcguir-Keletz, Pintz, Dam, Wade, Wallington, Warren, Westwater, Yeung, ; ex officio (non-voting): ADRs Artino (SMHS), Colby (LAW), Cornwell (ESIA), Downie (CCAS), Freund (GSEHD), Hall (SMHS), Hyder (SPH), Mallinson (SMHS), McNelis (SON), Miller (SMHS), Yang (GWSB), Zhang (SEAS), Sommers (Library), AVP Research Lohr, VP Research Norris, VP Graduate Affairs Subramanian.

Meetings: The Faculty Senate Research Committee held monthly meetings via Zoom (September – April) on 09/07/22, 10/23/22, 11/04/22, 12/02/2022, 01/20/23, 03/03/23 and 04/07/23. Each meeting had following standing items on the agenda:

- Report from OVPR (VPR Norris, AVPR Lohr, AVPOSP Ezelikova)
- Report from POD leaders (ADR Downie, ADR Adnan, ADR Miller)

OVPR and POD Functioning. The committee is thankful to OVPR and POD administration for attending each meeting and engaging with the FSRC. OVPR and The POD leaders have provided monthly updates to the committee about the issues faced by the units, specifically those related to staffing. FSRC members continued to voice concerns about the HR related difficulties to fully staff the PODs and the OSP and frequent staff departure. OSP recently saw the departure of three senior administrators (AVP Research Integrity Garrity, Director Research Integrity Sanders, Director Research Safety Jais). VP Research Norris kept the committee abreast of the steps that her office took to mitigate the immediate issues arising from these departures including hiring Sonya Hadrigan as an Interim AVP Research Integrity. More resources will be needed for supporting the research infrastructure. AVPOSP Ezelikova made a detailed presentation of the award setup process.

Research Ecosystem. The committee was tasked to examine how the centralization of services at the university affected the research ecosystem. Survey responses from voting members noted that shared services/ centralization of IT, Research Administration, and Human Resources were services that had the greatest impact on research. Other service areas that had significant impact included finance and shared facilities. The committee has voted to revisit the two ecosystem reviews performed in 2018 and 2019. The committee was surveyed to assess how has each component of the Ecosystem review had been affected by the GW Shared Services as a whole, pre and post award processing were perceived as most affected followed by resource allocation, research integrity and compliance, and workforce development. The major restructuring of the research administration in the wake of Covid has severely impacted the initial assumptions and the context of the original review. The committee has decided to investigate award processing (pre/post) of the eight topics examined in the two reviews and how the current structures address the issues identified.

Institute and Center Chartering. OVPR revised its document for GW institutes and Centers. The GW institutes are now defined as multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary scholarly units involving faculty from two or more schools. The centers are defined as units within individual colleges to be locally administered, reviewed, and overseen by the respective colleges. There was a proposal for FSRC to oversee the process of Institute chartering. In the end in consultation with FSEC, institute chartering was deemed to be an administrative function which doesn't belong to a senate committee. FSRC would help OVPR with the chartering process.

FSRC interactions with FS Library: FS Library co-chairs Professors Dugan and Schwindt had a zoom discussion with FSRC co-chairs. They were invited to present their deliberations related to open-access research at GW. The presentation discussed the recent changes by publication houses removing widely materials without prior discussion and thereby adversely affecting the GW academic community. They also noted the 2015 GW Faculty Senate Resolution on open-access policy for research publication. FSRC expressed its support for promoting open access research at GW and requests adequate resources for the library for its proper functioning.

Board of Trustees Research Representation: FSRC remains committed to advocating for research representation within the structure of the BOT and are looking forward to engaging with the incoming President to advance the research agenda.



Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE CALENDAR¹ **2023-2024 Academic Year**

FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS²

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS⁴

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

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

FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 2, 2023

4:00-5:30pm

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

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

³ First meeting of the 2024-2025 Academic Year session

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

⁵ Joint meeting of the outgoing and incoming Executive Committees

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

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

Appointment, Salary, & Promotion Policies

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

Athletics & Recreation

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

Educational Policy & Technology

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

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

Fiscal Planning & Budgeting

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

Honors & Academic Convocations

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

Rosseau, Gail	SMHS	Voting
Schwindt, Rhonda*	SON	Voting

Libraries

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

Physical Facilities

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

Levers, Kyle	GWSPH	Voting
Mahshie, James	CCAS	Voting
McCarthy, Eli	CCAS	Voting
Murphy, Terry	Provost	Nonvoting
Pagel, Scott	LAW	Voting
Pericak, Arlene	SON	Voting
Pittman, Delishia*	GSEHD	Voting
Reeves, Mark	CCAS	Voting
Rohrbeck, Cynthia	CCAS	Voting
Tate, James	GWPD	Nonvoting
Thessin, Rebecca	GSEHD	Voting
Zeman, Robert*	SMHS	Voting

Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom

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

Seager, Jennifer	GWSPH	Voting
Sheehi, Lara	CCAS	Voting
Walters-Edwards, Doreen	SEAS Staff	Voting
Waraksa, Elizabeth	LAI	Voting
Wargotz, Eric	SMHS	Voting
Wasserman, Alan	SMHS	Voting
Weitzner, Richard	OGC	Nonvoting
Whitt, Karen	SON	Voting
Zhang, Xiaoke	SEAS	Voting

Research

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

Van Dam, Rob	GWSPH	Voting
Wallington, Sherrie	SON	Voting
Warren, John	CPS	Voting
Wei, Peng	SEAS	Voting
Yang, Jiawen	GWSB	Nonvoting
Yeung, Ellen	CCAS	Voting
Zhang, Grace	SEAS	Nonvoting

University & Urban Affairs

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

*Faculty Senator

**Administrative Committee Appointments
2023-2024**

Appeals Board		Term Ends
Baker, Robert	CCAS	summer 2025
Sullivan, David	SMHS	summer 2025
Ganjoo, Rohini	SMHS	summer 2024
Kasle, Jill	CCAS	summer 2024

University Integrity & Conduct Council		
El-Banna, Majeda	SON	summer 2024
Cobb Kung, Bethany	CCAS	summer 2024
Speck, Erin	CCAS	summer 2024
Gray, Elizabeth	GWSPH	summer 2024
Kleppinger, Kathryn	CCAS	summer 2024
Bronner, Ben	GWSB	summer 2024

Student Discrimination Report Committee		
Cassar, Linda	SON	summer 2024
Core, Cynthia	CCAS	summer 2024
Eglitis, Daina	CCAS	summer 2024
Ellis, Wendy	GWSPH	summer 2024
Geron, Tippi	SMHS	summer 2024
Gonzalez-McLean, Juliana	SON	summer 2024
Kim, Immanuel	CCAS	summer 2024
LeLacheur, Susan	SMHS	summer 2024
Parker, Maggie	GSEHD	summer 2024
Traub, John	CCAS	summer 2024
Zysmilich, Martin	CCAS	summer 2024

Dispute Resolution Committee		
Bukrinsky, Michael	SMHS	April 30, 2024
Core, Cynthia	CCAS	April 30, 2024
Carrillo, Arturo	LAW	April 30, 2024
Clayton, Jennifer	GSEHD	April 30, 2024
Vyas, Amita	GWSPH	April 30, 2024
Pittman, Delishia	GSEHD	April 30, 2025
Bailey, James	GWSB	April 30, 2025
Packer, Randall	CCAS	April 30, 2025
Pelzman, Joseph	ESIA	April 30, 2025
Cseh, Maria	GSEHD	April 30, 2025
Pintz, Christine	SON	April 30, 2026
Garris, Charles	SEAS	April 30, 2026
Stein, Mary Beth	CCAS	April 30, 2026
Schwindt, Rhonda	SON	April 30, 2026
Seavey, Ormond	CCAS	April 30, 2026



Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)
May 12, 2023
Ilana Feldman, Chair

FSEC Chair Incoming Reflections

I want to begin by thanking my colleagues---in FSEC, the Faculty Senate more broadly, and in the wider university community---for what I already know to be their active engagement and collaboration. The deep commitment of the faculty to the fundamental principles and practices that enable the University to thrive is inspiring. Thanks also to Jim Tielsch, my predecessor as FSEC Chair, for his guidance and insights about the role (I am certain I am not done asking his advice).

Today the Senate offered our appreciation to President Wrighton for his service and leadership. I add my personal thanks for his efforts to foster an open and collaborative atmosphere. This approach has supported the work of the Senate and its committees, including FSEC.

As we prepare to welcome a new President to the University, I hope that we will seize the opportunity to develop a strong working relationship between the faculty and soon-to-be President Granberg. I see helping to build this relationship as a primary goal for FSEC in the coming year.

Another goal is to continue the important work that has already been done on enhancing shared governance at the University. FSEC will continue to press the Board of Trustees and the Administration on operationalizing the principles that were articulated in the Shared Governance Principles document.

FSEC Activities

The Board and Senate Executive Committees will hold their next joint meeting on Thursday, May 18. We will continue the discussion we began at our last joint meeting about mechanisms to create more connections between the Board and the Faculty Senate. We will also discuss the Board process for deciding to arm some members of GWPD. The outgoing and incoming FSECs met on April 28. Most of the meeting was taken up with discussion of Senate response to this decision and to the fact that FSEC was confidentially apprised of the decision ahead of the wider community. This discussion led to the issuing of two statements, one from the outgoing FSEC describing the discussions and one from the incoming FSEC outlining the decision to request an executive session at today's Senate meeting in order to have an open conversation about the role of FSEC in shared governance and the handling of confidential information.

Senate Committees

FSEC will send Senate standing committee charges in the coming weeks. Any charge suggestions for FSEC's consideration should be sent as soon as possible to Liz Carlson in the Senate office.

Personnel Actions

There are no active grievances at the university.

Calendar

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is August 25, 2023. Draft resolutions and any other possible Senate agenda items should be forwarded to Liz Carlson in the Senate office as soon as possible to assist with the timely compilation of the FSEC meeting agenda, ideally by August 18, 2023. The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting is September 8, 2023. Pending the successful completion of IT upgrades to the State Room, we expect that this meeting will be held in a hybrid format.



Faculty Senate
Provost Bracey Remarks
Friday, May 12, 2023

Good afternoon, everyone. I know we all have much to attend to as the year comes to a close, so I will keep this brief.

Welcome new senators

First, I would like to welcome all the new faculty senators for the 2023-24 academic year. I look forward to working alongside all of you as we advance our academic enterprise.

End of semester

As the president mentioned, we have held numerous events to recognize scholarly achievement in our community. On April 20, we recognized distinguished student achievement in the Academic Honors Ceremony. The third cohort of the Academic Leadership Academy, or GWALA, graduated on Friday, April 28. And we held the Faculty Honors Ceremony last Thursday, May 4, where we were very excited to be able to recognize faculty and graduate teaching assistants for excellence in teaching, service, and research. There are GW Today articles recapping all of these events if you would like to learn more about the honorees.

Of course, next week is Commencement Week. I encourage all of you, and your colleagues, to attend school and college celebrations and Commencement on the National Mall on Sunday, May 21. Registration for Commencement Week activities closes TODAY, so please visit the [Commencement website](#) and register for these celebrations as well as other school and department events if you have not already done so. It is an important milestone in our students' lives, and a strong faculty presence signals to our students, their families and invited guests, and community at large our shared investment in our students' many accomplishments and celebration of all they will achieve when they leave GW.

Academic Leadership Academy

Speaking of the Academic Leadership Academy, nominations for the fourth cohort are now open. I encourage eligible faculty members to nominate themselves or others for the chance to partake in this exciting professional development opportunity. Interested parties can visit chairs.provost.gwu.edu to find the nomination forms.

Spring Grades

A quick housekeeping note on spring grades. It is very important that faculty submit grades as soon as possible after the completion of final exams. University policy requires that grades be submitted within five business days of the exam, or after the final class meeting if no exam is given. They can be submitted online 24/7. Grades not being submitted on time can negatively affect a student's financial aid and academic standing and can delay the conferral of a student's degree. Please help us honor our commitment to offering students the best possible experience by meeting this deadline. And please remind your colleagues!