



# Faculty Senate

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SENATE MEETING  
HELD ON MAY 9, 2025  
HYBRID: 1957 E STREET/STATE ROOM & ZOOM**

Present: President Granberg; Provost Bracey; Executive Committee Chair Schultheiss; Parliamentarian Binder; Registrar Cloud; Senate Office Staff Liz Carlson and Jenna Chaojareon; Deans Ayres, Feuer, Goldman, Henry, Kelly-Weeder, Matthew, Riddle, and Wahlbeck; Interim Dean Perry; Professors Akman, Badie, Belenky, Briggs, Brinkerhoff, Callier, Cheh, Cottrol, Crandall, Cseh, Eakle, Engel, Fagan, Feldman, Hernandez, Kay, Kieff, Kulp, Markus, McAlister, Mendelowitz, Merluzzi, Mylonas, Orti, Rain, Rigg, Sarkar, Schwindt, Vyas, Warren, Warshaw, Wilson, and Wirtz.

Absent: Deans Bass and Lach; Professors Bamford, Borum, Core, El-Ghazawi, Gore, Trangsrud, and White.

## CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:02p.m.

## ELECTION OF THE 2025-2026 SENATE PARLIAMENTARIAN

By unanimous consent, Professor Sarah Binder was elected as the 2025-2026 Senate Parliamentarian.

## ELECTION OF THE 2025-2026 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Feldman, who chaired the nominating committee for the 2025-2026 Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), presented the slate on behalf of the committee. No additional nominations were presented. The Senate elected Professor Schultheiss as the 2025-2026 Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) and then elected the remaining [2025-2026 FSEC slate](#) as a whole. President Granberg noted that the FSEC term runs from its election at the May Senate meeting until the new FSEC is elected at the following year's May meeting.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Parliamentarian explained that Robert's Rules of Order and the Senate bylaws does not require "approval" of the Senate minutes. Instead, a Senate member wishing to amend the minutes should request a correction to the minutes.

Professor Cohen-Cole requested a correction to reflect the President's response following Professor Brinkerhoff's question about university-provided assistance for any faculty who might experience visa issues while traveling this coming summer. He noted that the minutes reflected no response from the President

following Professor Brinkerhoff's question, instead immediately moving to Professor Sarkar's comment. Ms. Carlson confirmed that the meeting record noted the following:

Professor Brinkerhoff: "...Is GW prepared to provide some support for them, including legal support? Who's going to pay those legal fees? Thank you."  
President Granberg: "Thanks for that, Jennifer. Anybody else?"

There were no objections to this correction, and the minutes were approved as corrected.

No corrections were offered to the [minutes](#) of the April 11, 2025, Faculty Senate executive session.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SENATE MEMBERS BEGINNING TERMS (Ellen Granberg, President)

President Granberg recognized the Senate members who are beginning their terms with today's meeting:

- Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (CCAS): Jamie Cohen-Cole, Melani McAlister, & Siobhan Rigg
- GW School of Business (GWSB): Jennifer Merluzzi
- GW Law School: Robert Cottrol
- Milken Institute School of Public Health (GWSPH): Anne Markus
- School of Medicine & Health Sciences (SMHS): Karen Fagan & David Mendelowitz

#### PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Ellen Granberg, President)

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

#### BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Professor Wirtz, observing that this is the end of the academic year, raised the ongoing issue of losses—likely in excess of \$80 million this year—incurred by the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA). He recalled raising some issues with regard to the budget at the beginning of the year, with the MFA being one. The response then and throughout the academic year from the administration has been that they are working on it. Now, at the end of the academic year, this seems to be a continuing mantra, and this issue is having a dramatic impact on the affairs of the university. He expressed his concern that the MFA issue seems to be having a gross impact on the university writ large and is not appearing in the President's remarks to the Senate. He noted that he is most concerned that there is uncertainty around whether the Senate is in a position to say that it has great faith in the administration and the Board to be able to navigate their way out of this problem. All the Senate keeps hearing is that a solution is coming; Professor Wirtz stressed that the time is now and that a solution needed to have been reached by now. He expressed his and his colleagues' concern as to whether the administration and the Board are actually up to the task of handling this problem. With the complete radio silence on this issue, questions are growing about where the situation stands and why there is no forward movement in evidence.

The President responded that she thought of Professor Wirtz and his previous comments on the MFA issue when preparing her remarks for today's meeting. She recalled her response at the April Senate meeting—that when she is able to share something, she will—and knew that Professor Wirtz would raise this question again today. She expressed her wish that she could speak to the work underway on the MFA issue, stressing that she completely understood why there are concerns. She did share that she is seeing progress made and

real decisions being discussed. She affirmed that she has great faith in the team working on this and added that she would love to be able to say more but unfortunately cannot at the present moment.

Professor Wirtz noted that this is exactly what the Senate has been hearing for nine months, which raises real questions about the confidence that the faculty has in the ability of the administration and the Board to tackle this issue, which is not a minor problem. The last number he recalled hearing was an \$80 million loss by the MFA this year; he stated he would not be surprised, given the announcement from Provost Bracey, Vice President Fernandes, and Chief of Staff Mory this week, to hear that the losses are now expected to be even greater. At this point, he stated, there is almost a crisis of confidence in the ability of the administration and the Board to deal with what is a very large elephant in the room that is impacting the entire university. He asked when a solution to this problem will be reached.

The President responded that she thought there was a very good chance that, by the time the Senate returns in the fall, there will be information to share. She asked the Senate to remember that this work involves a complicated, three-party conversation. The team working on the MFA issue is excellent, and the President shared that some change-outs were made to the team in order to bring in some stronger people. They are doing an excellent job. The President affirmed that she absolutely understands why Professor Wirtz is saying what he is and that he has the right to say it; she also appreciated why people would wonder what is actually happening. She stated again that she really can't talk about this work at present that she was sorry no to be able to share more at the moment. She stated that the conversations that are going on need to be allowed to go on, and talking about it in public is not going to help. Professor Wirtz responded that this puts the Senate in extremely awkward position because, sooner or later, push will come to shove with regard to the MFA.

Professor Akman referenced a recent Washington Post article about the impending recession in the District and the broader region secondary to the job cuts impacting every aspect of the local economy. He noted he has been thinking about this issue in different ways: from the perspective of students whose parents are federal employees and adjunct faculty who are federal employees (many of whom may be losing their jobs), but also from the viewpoint that GW is a huge economic engine in the region. In the face of federal government losses, federal employee losses, etc., he wondered if there is an opportunity for universities in the District to present themselves as partners to the District around the economy in a positive way. There are many faculty, staff, and students who live in and around the District and spend money in the District. Even though the university is tax exempt, its community spends a lot of money, particularly when considered alongside the other District universities. He wondered whether, as the university negotiates with city about the campus plan, enrollment caps, and other issues, there might be leverage for the university in thinking about what it is able to provide to the District.

The President responded that this has been a topic of discussion in a number of different circles, and there has been some conversation about whether this campus plan can be thought about differently because of the opportunity GW has to partner more closely with the District. There has also been some discussion among the DC universities about whether working together may be a way to fill in some gaps. She appreciated Professor Akman's point and noted there are a number of ways in which there are opportunities for this to play out.

Professor Cohen-Cole followed up on Professor Wirtz's comments and the concern around a potential loss of confidence in how the MFA ship is being steered. Understanding that the President can't speak in public about the actions being taken by the university with respect to negotiations with the hospital group, he asked whether there might be actions that could be taken internally by the administration around its

conversations with the Board and potential communication about those discussions. He referenced Resolving Clause 5 of [Senate Resolution 24/7](#), in which the Senate requested that, each year, the leadership of the university, together with the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs, prepare a report that looks at the impact of ongoing losses at the MFA on other units of the university. He noted that this came up through the Educational Policy & Technology (EPT) committee because the university community was assured by leadership (the then-CFO, President Wrighton, and Dean Bass) that there would be no impact of MFA losses. In retrospect, this seems to be either faulty analysis or a lack of transparency on the part of those who were making those statements. To increase transparency, he stated, it would help a great deal if the President could assure the faculty that this kind of analysis is in fact happening. He noted that he was raising this point as Professor Wagner asked a similar question in a recent Senate meeting; it seems that anyone taking their fiduciary responsibility to the university seriously would be doing a cost-benefit analysis of ongoing \$100 million annual losses. He asked whether the President would encourage the Board to undertake this kind of analysis. He affirmed that he was not asking for public statements on the nature of the actions with the hospital group; rather, the faculty would be encouraged to know whether or not this analysis is happening, as, from where he and his colleagues sit, it appears analysis around annual \$100 million losses is not happening.

The President responded that how she thinks about this issue—and how she believes the Board thinks as well—is that the focus and attention right now is on ending these losses. They are unacceptable and absolutely have to end; at the moment, that is where the focus and attention of the Board needs to be. She noted that she completely understood why Professor Cohen-Cole asked this question, particularly because of the memo that came out last week acknowledging some effect of the MFA losses. She noted that it would be fair for the administration to expand on that and provide more information about what was meant by that. She further stated that if, in the fall, the university is in a place where there is not a good path and where she is not confident that the losses are going to come to an end, then she would pick this conversation up again. At the moment, the focus needs to remain exactly where it is, which is on ending the losses. A post-mortem analysis would be a route to consider if indeed there is good news to report in the fall.

CFO Fernandes agreed with the President's comments, noting that the challenge stems from the complexity of the issues. He affirmed that he has been trying to be as transparent as possible in the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting (FPB) committee meetings and has scheduled additional meetings to further talk through the issue. While he will continue to try and have those conversations, he agreed with the President that the focus is on getting costs under control and ending the losses. Holding these discussions in a public forum is very challenging in terms of what can and can't be discussed in that format, which is why he is trying to provide information in the FPB meetings to be able to deliver the kind of analysis Professor Cohen-Cole referenced. He hoped those open discussions in FPB could continue, and, to the President's point, he hoped that by the end of the summer additional information can be shared publicly with the Senate.

Professor Wilson, understanding that discussions are taking place and that the administration and the Board are working on the issue, asked whether there is a "plan B" if the MFA's losses cannot be brought to an end. The President responded that "plans A, B, and C" have always been part of the current work around this issue because these losses cannot continue. She stated that neither she nor the Board will allow the MFA's losses to continue ad infinitum. There are backup plans, and she stated that she has optimism that there will be real news by the time the Senate meets next in the fall and that she will "shout it from the hilltops."

## PROVOST'S REPORT (Chris Bracey, Provost)

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

### BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PROVOST'S REPORT

Professor Crandall posed a question about the Vice Provost for Research position. With all due respect to Dr. Miller, he noted that Dr. Miller is now serving for a second time as Interim Vice Provost for Research, with a short stint in between held by someone in the permanent position. He expressed concern that the university does not seem to have full and steady leadership in this area, something very much needed given GW's focus on research as a core element of its activities, its advancement into the AAU, and its future strategic plan. He expressed his admiration for Dr. Miller but recognized that he has a full-time job within SMHS that necessarily requires his attention. The university deserves a full-time, permanent person in the Vice Provost for Research position and expressed his concern that the position has been held on an interim basis for so many of the past several years.

The Provost responded that the expectation when Dr. Miller returned for a second interim stint was to have him focus on a couple of aspects of the research enterprise that needed shoring up: recasting the pod system to better support and engage researchers, and strengthening the research integrity and compliance side of the office. Dr. Miller has completed the former and is now working on the latter. There have obviously been some changes in the federal administration that have placed additional pressure on the research ecosystem. Therefore, as the administration began thinking about cycling Dr. Miller back into his SMHS role, it became evident that the university really needed someone with experience to help guide the GW research enterprise through this transitional period. Dr. Miller has agreed to remain in the interim position for a couple more months, but the Provost affirmed that he and the President have talked about the importance of bringing in a permanent Vice Provost for Research and fully expect to conduct a national search to fill that role.

Professor Wirtz recalled questions raised at the last Senate meeting about important faculty initiatives—in particular within GWSB but not limited to that school—that seem to have disappeared from budget. In the intervening time, he noted, that particular problem seems to have been solved. He noted, though, a concern arising from that discussion. In particular, as part of the exchange during that meeting, one Senate member suggested (and he agreed) that it sounded as though a dean had been “thrown under the bus”—as if somehow there was a deficiency in what the dean or school had done that was leading to the problem under discussion. It ultimately felt to him as if the CFO was also finding his way under the same bus. Professor Wirtz wondered if, at this point, the Provost would like to offer any clarifying points that would suggest that perhaps this is not a perception that the Senate and the community writ large should carry away from his remarks during that meeting.

Provost Bracey thanked Professor Wirtz for the opportunity, as he did believe there was some misperception about the exchange. He stated that when deans—who make decisions all the time—make big decisions, they do not make them in isolation. Rather, those decisions are made in consultation, typically with the Provost, particularly if they are going to be matters of consequence. The decision to try to trim the sails of the GWSB budget (in particularly its expenditures) in anticipation of the fiscal year close, was a conversation that the dean and Provost had. They discussed all the different ways in which this goal could be achieved, and that included curtailing some of the summer compensation for certain faculty that was discretionary within the GWSB budget. He noted that they were looking for ways to make up for the shortfall in graduate enrollment. At the time, the Provost stated, his understanding was that there was a certain number that needed to be attained and that, in order to get there, they would need to potentially cut

or limit some of the summer compensation that many of the senior or most productive faculty would anticipate receiving; this was discretionary funding. The Provost believed that the decision to move in that direction was what precipitated GWSB colleagues coming to their Senate representatives with concerns. The Provost reported that, having gone back to the dean after confirming that the revenue shortfall did exist and that the revenue was not in GWSB to support this discretionary spending, the dean and Provost were able to reach a resolution with the CFO to find some sourcing for that funding for this fiscal year only. Going forward, it will have to be the case that revenue sources are identified to support that discretionary expense.

Professor Wirtz thanked the Provost for these comments. He noted that, with regard to the way these issues were handled, it did seem that the administration had cherry-picked items for post hoc exclusion from the school's budget. Understanding that this may be a misperception, he asked whether it is the case that the administration can in fact cherry-pick items for removal from a previously-approved budget. The Provost responded that he can dispel that notion. He stated that, in the event of a revenue shortfall, the dean and Provost will look at everything in the expense budget to see what areas can be cut. Certain things can be cut that are less impactful than others, and the dean and Provost try to minimize the injury produced when trimming the budget sails in this way. This is done in conversation with the administrative leadership of the school, so he did not feel Professor Wirtz's characterization of the process was accurate.

Professor Feldman noted that she is getting questions about the budget cuts and the decision to withhold merit for now. She framed her question by saying that she believes all faculty understand the environment the university is in and the challenges it is facing. No one is naïve about that, nor does anyone imagine that the administration is making decisions about this lightly. At the same time, in an inflationary environment, no merit is effectively a salary cut and impacts people's capacity to meet their expenses. In order to help the community feel more at ease with this move, she asked:

- 1) In grappling with challenging current environment, what did the leadership weigh and how did they arrive at the determination to delay merit—in other words, what things beyond salary might have been cut?
- 2) The message last week mentioned that the decision to suspend merit increases would be revisited in the fall. To the extent the Provost can speak to this, what does the leadership need to see to return raises to faculty and staff?

The Provost noted that this was a difficult memo to write and a difficult decision to reach. When the senior leadership was talking it through, they felt it was important to highlight context, which they did in the memo by helping the community to understand and appreciate range of headwinds and uncertainty the university is facing. In the face of those headwinds and uncertainty, the leadership was not confident—in enrollment projections, the ability to receive IDCs from the federal government, and the ability to receive funds for grants that were already approved and appropriated—and did not want to put the university in a financially unstable position. The leadership prioritized the ability to retain people and not have to force furloughs or anything of that nature. Given that, along with the structural deficit, the decision was made that the best thing the leadership could do to preserve university personnel and to ensure it is also addressing the structural deficit was a combination of expense-cutting and forgoing merit. Should some of the headwinds will become tailwinds (e.g., pickups on enrollment, particularly graduate), then leadership will be in a position to go back and provide that merit increase. There were a variety of different things that could have been done—cutting the budget more substantially would have resulted in staff layoffs and furloughs.

CFO Fernandes affirmed the Provost's comments, noting that the leadership spent a lot of time looking at this very carefully; he noted that they wanted especially to avoid institutionalized layoffs. He observed that

GW is not alone in these measures; universities across the country are instituting freezes and layoffs, and cutting programs and costs. With the information they had, GW's leadership was trying to create a situation that would be the least disruptive possible. Should things improve later in the year, these measures can be reassessed. However, without taking these actions, the CFO noted that he was concerned the university would have had to take stronger measures that would have been more detrimental to the university. This is a step in the right direction, and the university can get there by working together and being transparent and collaborative.

Professor Schultheiss noted that the July 1 merit cycle is relatively new. She asked why September 1 wasn't the cycle date to begin with, as there will always be uncertainty around enrollment if merit decisions are being made ahead of a July 1 implementation. CFO Fernandes responded that this is a good point and is one of the things his office is looking at; this may provide an opportunity to reassess the calendar.

Professor Orti offered the following comments:

Regarding the Guidelines for University Policy Review process mentioned by the Provost, I would like to offer quick updates on behalf of the Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) committee in the absence of a formal annual report (that is overdue and will be forthcoming). We apologize about that.

At our last Senate meeting, PEAFF presented a report on the newly proposed Guidelines for University policy review Process that provided critical feedback. Since then, the Administration has revised the document by considering feedback they received from PEAFF, the Student Government Association, and the Staff Council. VP Mory kindly sent to PEAFF this revised version on April 29.

After extensive discussion at our last meeting 3 days ago, the committee is not yet ready to endorse this new draft of the 'Guidelines for University Policy Review Process.' Although many see the latest revisions as a positive development and we all consider that the document will improve the University's decision-making process and promote transparency, the committee remains unconvinced that the totality of the process outlined in the Guidelines document is fully consistent with shared governance as understood by the AAUP and as agreed upon in our Statement of Shared Governance Principles of 2022.

We understand that the process described in this document is currently being implemented as interim policy to review changes in several university policies and that the Administration aspires to adopt it formally by May 12. Unfortunately, given time constraints and scheduling conflicts, we are unable to provide at this time specific recommendations or to introduce a Senate Resolution for consideration of the Faculty Senate before the end of AY 2025. Therefore, endorsement from the PEAFF committee (and the Faculty Senate at large) for the Guidelines document remains pending until we can reconvene and dedicate sufficient time in the upcoming Fall semester to provide additional feedback. We understand that, in the meantime, the Administration will continue to implement this process as interim policy, as necessary.

We thank the Administration for the opportunity to share our views on this important document and hope that we can revisit this issue in the Fall.

The Provost thanked Professor Orti for his comments.

Professor Mylonas noted that he was in the unfortunate position of serving on the Senate during the last time merit increases were suspended. At that point, he also served on the Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies (ASPP) committee with Professor Gupta; the committee realized that promotion-related salary increases for faculty were also frozen at that time. He observed that the language this time is vague and does not specify whether this is the case with the current suspension of merit increases. He noted that the Senate passed a resolution at the point of the previous merit suspension addressing this issue and asked whether the current merit suspension applies to faculty promotion increases as well. He also asked whether the current merit suspension impacts both faculty and staff, as the memo was not clear on this point. The Provost responded that faculty promotion bumps were not mentioned in the memo—they remain in place. The memo applies to faculty and staff across the board, which is part of why faculty promotion bumps were not addressed specifically. The merit suspension does apply to both faculty and staff.

The Provost also offered a clarification on the policy development policy in response to Professor Orti's earlier comment. The policy is being adopted as a full policy on May 12, not as an interim policy, while the Senate endorsement is still pending.

Professor Cohen-Cole posed questions related to the points raised by Professors Feldman and Mylonas. He asked whether revenue from tuition increases goes to schools so that they can reduce or avoid layoffs at the school level, thereby maintaining course offerings and critical services for students, such as advising. He put this in the context of the 3% across-the-board budget reduction, recalling that, during the COVID era, there was a lack of strategic planning around where cuts would be implemented.

Next, from the colleagues he has spoken with, he relayed questions about whether the present budget cuts will be focused on certain areas, in particular which areas might be asked to cut more than 3%. He requested reassurance that there would be no non-academic units with budget cuts under 3%. He also asked for clarity from the leadership about areas where money might be saved, noting concerns around large consulting projects that have persisted (from Disney several years ago to other expenditures more recently on firms like Academic Analytics, Gallup, Lewis-Burke, and Grant/Thornton, among others). Many of these expenditures relate to things the university needs to do, but there are questions about what needs to happen in the current environment.

Finally, he noted concern about “golden parachutes” to former executives and increasing compensation packages for executives and executive staff. He asked whether the leadership has looked at reducing these overall numbers so that students—who ultimately provide the funding for the functioning of the university—can be assured that cuts are not being made to first-level essentials such as course offerings and academic and career advising.

With regard to tuition increases, the Provost confirmed that the distribution of revenues from tuition has not changed—the same portions are still distributed to the schools and financial aid. In terms of the 3% budget cut, he noted that all units are being asked to do so, not just the schools. Every unit is modeling the 3% budget cut. The reality, he stated, is that some units will be able to do more, and some less. Once leadership hears back from the units in terms of what they are capable of trimming without ultimately harming the student experience in some material way, adjustments will be made. With regard to concerns about growth in the administrative apparatus—whether through additional executives or consultants/purchased services—he stated that the leadership is going to look at this as well and be sure they are as transparent as possible. From preliminary data he has seen, the Provost relayed that it appears there has been some growth across the board—in faculty units, schools, and staff. The real question is

whether any of that growth has been exponentially large or of particular concern. He invited the CFO to add his comments.

CFO Fernandes concurred with the Provost's remarks, noting that all expenses across the board would be reviewed, at every level of the university. The reason the leadership chose to roll it out this way, he stated, is to allow the deans and division leads to opine on how to do this in their units. The administration is not driving a particular narrative; rather, this is an open, collaborative process that the leadership will work through over the summer. This is why the administration is not presenting a budget to the Board at its meeting next week; there needs to be time taken to work through this process and look at various expenses.

The President added that it is important to be mindful of purchased services while going through a situation like this. Some institutions, she noted, have asked whether more structural changes in how purchased services are handled would save a significant amount of money. As an example, she relayed that the Ohio State University performed this kind of analysis and discovered that they were sourcing 35 different kinds of French fries, creating additional costs for RFPs, sourcing, inventorying, etc. She noted that she did not know whether this kind of issue exists at GW, but she has seen other institutions periodically take a look, and this makes sense. Once the university gets through the present work to get the FY26 budget together, she stated that it's possible there is some opportunity there. She noted that this is always something to watch to ensure that what these types of expense activities are really going to benefit the institution.

Professor Wilson asked whether the annual reports completed for this merit cycle—that will now not be used to determine merit increases as planned—will be included in the calculus when merit increases return. Next, he noted his full confidence in this administration—adding that he could not say the same about previous administrations—but expressed his view that the faculty needs something approaching a veto that would allow them to reject an unreasonable policy. Noting concerns around the policy development review policy, he stressed that PEAFF's concerns aren't residual.

The Provost responded that performance review processes for faculty and staff are important regardless of merit availability, as everyone is entitled to feedback on their performance. If merit can be reinstated, these materials will be available as a basis upon which to issue increases. Should merit not be reinstated until after next year, he did not know if he could commit to relying on this year's annual reports and looked to the President for her thoughts. The President gave a definite yes, especially for faculty, noting that a book published this year absolutely needs to be counted.

In response to Professor Wilson's second question, the Provost noted that they were both part of prior administrations that were more challenging. He observed that faculty have many ways to express their opinions about university decision-making. The Senate can do so through a resolution, and faculty members can provide direct feedback through the new process as interested stakeholders; he noted that this feedback piece is more inclusive than previous. Faculty can do other things, too, beyond voicing their opinion through these formal mechanisms, to articulate their discomfort or the fact that they don't necessarily approve of any particular set of administrative decisions. Faculty retain all of that; the formal mechanisms are the ones that are recognized in the principles of shared governance, but he stated that faculty have the ability to communicate beyond what's been articulated in those shared principles.

Professor Wilson observed that there is a vast difference between consulting on something and being able to say no to something; consultation can be ignored. The Provost responded that he understood this concern and believed they had a disagreement on this point. Currently, the arrangement is governed by shared governance and the principles of shared governance that were agreed to a couple of years ago. He

understood Professor Wilson might want to revisit some of that; there may be a future conversation to have around these ideas. Professor Wilson stated that he didn't think there was anything in the shared governance document that states the faculty doesn't get a say a meaningful say in decisions around how the university is run. The Provost suggested taking this conversation offline but added that the principles of shared governance also do not confer a veto option to the faculty.

Professor Orti confirmed with the Provost that the Policy Development Process policy will be adopted on May 12 and noted that it will go into effect without yet being endorsed by PEAFF or the Senate. He wished that the Senate could say it wholeheartedly supports this policy and noted that PEAFF hoped to bring this forward in the fall.

Professor Wirtz, noting that the 3% budget cut is predicated on avoiding layoffs, observed that this takes a big hit to the non-compensation budget and that the schools don't have funds to cut without making sizable cuts to their programmatic activities. Next, he noted that, as evidenced on the last several Form 990s filed by the university, there has been a lot of compensation awarded to prior officers of the university. This contributes a lot to the financial pain the university is currently suffering. He asked whether the new Form 990 will show this as well. He also asked whether the university is making provisions to avoid the same thing in the future. The President responded in the negative to this question. She stated that she did not know what the original agreements were and does not know how long they last; she was not sure what this Form 990 will show. Professor Wirtz noted his hunch that the CFO might know; CFO Fernandes noted that there will be payments to officers that have departed the university on the new Form 990. Professor Wirtz observed that, between the MFA and compensation to prior officers, a considerable financial toll has been taken on the university. He hoped that the current administration realizes that what it does now can, as it has for prior administrations, take quite a toll on the institution. The President appreciated this point. She noted that she has been involved in exit agreements many times over her career. She observed that the ones she is seeing now are some of the most generous she has ever seen, adding that some are fulfilling contractual obligations. She affirmed that she really hears what Professor Wirtz is saying, especially when resources are very tight and everyone is being asked to tighten their belts; these inconsistencies hit particularly hard.

Professor Cohen-Cole circled back to a point that he raised earlier around the trustee's fiduciary duty to the university. He noted the President's comment that these payouts are among some of the largest that she has seen; he stated that some of the ways that the administration could help the faculty, community, staff, and students have more faith and confidence in in what happens going forward is identifying a way of articulating how current executives' incentives are aligned with the long-term interest of the university. He noted that it sounds like from what the President is saying that the trustees signed off on compensation agreements which were not aligned with the long-term interest of the university.

The President responded that she was not saying that at all. She reiterated her earlier comment that she has been involved in many of these agreements, and these are among the largest she has ever seen. However, that does not mean it was not in the best interest of the institution; she stated that Professor Cohen-Cole was making a leap that she was not saying. Professor Cohen-Cole apologized for inadvertently putting words in the President's mouth. He concluded with his earlier point, which is that, to the extent that the President and other members of the administration can reassure the community that the long-term interest of the university align with the President's and her staff's incentives, that would go a long way toward building confidence.

The President responded that GW needs and deserves excellent leadership, just as it needs and deserves excellent faculty. There is a marketplace for recruiting the best administrators just as there is a marketplace for recruiting the best faculty. The same thing happens with retention. If a university wants to retain the best faculty and the best administrators, it has to operate within the market. She affirmed that she and the Board look very carefully at whether or not the compensation agreements are appropriate to the market, as well as to nonprofit status. This is a process that unfolds within the Board; they are regular activities that take place on an annual basis and are vetted and validated by external organizations that specialize in how these markets work. She stated that, with what I have seen of GW's process, she believes it is as good as any that she has seen.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (Katrin Schultheiss, Chair)

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

#### BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

None.

#### INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

None.

#### GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Approval of the [2025-2026 Senate Calendar](#)
  - The calendar was approved by unanimous consent.
- II. Approval of the [2025-2026 Senate Standing Committee Chairs & Rosters](#)
  - The rosters were approved as a whole by unanimous consent. President Granberg noted that Senate standing committee terms run from their election at the May Senate meeting through the election of the new committee rosters at the following year's May meeting.
- III. Approval of the [2025-2026 Dispute Resolution Committee Chair & Roster](#)
  - The Dispute Resolution Committee chair and roster were approved as a whole by unanimous consent.
- IV. Approval of [2025-2026 Faculty Nominations to the Student Discrimination Report Committee](#)
  - The nominations were approved as a whole by unanimous consent.
- V. Senate Standing Committee Reports  
Annual reports were received from the [Athletics & Recreation](#), [Educational Policy & Technology](#), [Libraries](#), and [University & Urban Affairs](#) committees and are available on the Senate website.

In addition, EPT shared a [report on its joint recommendation with the Student Government Association \(SGA\) on GW'S Excused Absence Policy](#). EPT Co-Chair Jamie Cohen-Cole shared a brief overview of the joint recommendation. He noted that this recommendation emerges from seven separate meetings, in addition to deliberation outside of meetings, of EPT, the Student Government Association, and subcommittees connected between the two. The recommendation is that the current excused absence policy be more comprehensive and provide more clarity.

He referred the Senate to page 4 of the posted document, which includes the following recommendations:

- 1) Provide guidance on how an excused absence policy may cover undergraduate and graduate student absences for reasons of physical or mental health, family emergencies (e.g., students helping their single parents care for siblings), as well as longer absences for religious reasons such as Ramadan, addressing which absences will require documentation and of what type, and whether students may be allowed absences without requiring any evidence of an excusable circumstance, etc. This guidance should be uniform across the University Bulletin, the Faculty Handbook and the Registrar's website;
- 2) Provide examples/suggestions to faculty on how to design class attendance policies with some built-in flexibility (e.g., dropping a few attendance scores at the end of the semester; counting only 4 out of 5 quizzes towards the course grade; or other possibilities suitable for a particular course);
- 3) Provide faculty with a possible example script for the first day of class, clearly describing their attendance policy as well as instructions on how students can make up material missed during class absences (to be developed by DSS, CAPS and the GW Center for Teaching Excellence).
- 4) Provide examples/suggestions to students on how to make up missed classes without burdening the instructor.
- 5) Ensure that the revised policy is available to faculty and students not only in the University Bulletin, Faculty Handbook, and the website of the Office of the Registrar but also in the Faculty FAQs on Blackboard and in the syllabus template.
- 6) Ensure that the revised policy has been approved by all stakeholders by May 1 2026, so that it is available to faculty and students for implementation in AY 2026-2027.

Professor Cohen-Cole noted that one thing the group noticed in discussing these issues was that there was a lack of alignment in some of the places where the excused absences policy was posted. This lack of alignment showed up for a number of reasons; one is that, during the COVID period, there was a change of university policy around what kinds of documentation would be needed when students were sick.

The faculty have therefore requested that the Provost's office establish a committee to comprehensively update and modernize GW's excused absence policy, both for undergraduates and for graduate students, allowing for flexibility for the students. EPT requests that the committee include representatives from the EPT, the Student Government Association, Disability Support Services, Counseling and Psychological Services, Student Health Services, and the Center for Teaching and Excellence along with student success.

The prior pages to this document outline the number of meetings held and how the issue came to EPT. This was initially because a leader of the Student Government Association came to EPT to ask whether or not there would be specific carve-out for mental health days. EPT, along with the Student Government Association, ultimately decided that there shouldn't be a specific carve-out for that but rather that there should be a more general consideration about what the excused absence policy should look like and some clarification

thereof. Ultimately, Professor Cohen-Cole noted, the recommendation is more attention being drawn to this issue.

The President thanked Professor Cohen-Cole for this report.

### BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Professor Orti offered the following statement:

On the topic of institutional neutrality, I would like to offer a comment on behalf of PEAFF reaffirming the ideas offered in our statement from March 17 that was attached as Appendix 1 of Resolution 25/10.<sup>1</sup> This resolution was debated here at our last meeting and sent back to committee. Short of providing a revised version of this resolution for the consideration of the Senate due to time constraints, I would like to state for the record that a majority opinion in PEAFF supports the view that the university should not pursue a declaration of institutional neutrality at this time.

### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53pm.

---

<sup>1</sup> Senate Resolution 25/10 was discussed at the April 2025 Senate meeting; the Senate voted to return the resolution to PEAFF.



Faculty Senate

Proposed 2025-2026 Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)

CCAS: Katrin Schultheiss, Chair

CPS: John Warren

ESIA: Jennifer Brinkerhoff

GSEHD: Jonathan Eakle

GWSB: Arthur Wilson

GWSPH: Amita Vyas

LAW: Scott Kieff

SEAS: Sameh Badie

SMHS: Jeffrey Akman

SON: Rhonda Schwindt

**Faculty Senate  
President's Report  
May 9, 2025**

It's a pleasure to join you with GW's commencement on the horizon and to share some university news and updates. I want to again welcome the new Senate members, and I thank you for all you do to represent the GW faculty and to provide insight and guidance on some of the most pressing issues at the university. I also want to welcome back those returning to Senate service this year.

First, I want to acknowledge what I know many of you are feeling: frustration, uncertainty, and concern. Recent changes at the federal level have added a layer of complexity to a budget environment that was already under pressure. And I know that when it comes to budgets, people feel the impact personally and professionally.

Last week's message from Chris, Bruno, and Scott highlighted the actions we are taking to steward the university's resources so that we are able both to correct the structural imbalance in our budget as well as navigate the headwinds that are out of our hands. Those include changes to federal research funding, the risk of the government targeting other university funding, the possibility of disruptions to student aid distribution or international student enrollment, and economic and political instabilities, to name a few. As difficult as it will be, this course correction is of strategic importance to the university and will help us enormously as we move forward, particularly should the current instability continue over several years..

I appreciate all you can do as faculty senators to make sure that lines of communication remain open. I'm very grateful for the partnership, support, candor, and feedback many of you have shared. As I've mentioned before, my colleagues and I are working to stay informed, prepare for multiple scenarios, advocate for our community, and ensure GW remains as safe and secure as possible.

I've discussed with the executive committee the role faculty could play in supporting the university should we end up in the target of federal action and this will be a topic of discussion at the upcoming session between the BOT executive committee, FSEC, and university leadership.

In terms of the situation at the federal level, I am seeing some areas of escalation and others of retrenchment. For example, the war between Harvard and the Trump administration only appears to be escalating, as are the messages coming out of the Department of Education.

In the Department of Justice (DOJ), there looks to me to be some reorientation now that the new assistant attorney general for the civil rights division is in place. The department is not backing away from action directed at universities, but it does look like the new Assistant Attorney General is taking some time to consider how she wants to approach this part of her portfolio. As one example, several visits scheduled by the DOJ task force on antisemitism appear to be on hold for now. At the same time, the DOJ has sent out numerous inquiries focused on universities' compliance with the Supreme Court decision in *Students for Fair Admission vs. Harvard*, the decision that ended the consideration of race in college admissions.

The AAU has launched a targeted public relations campaign focused on support for research; all AAU members will support this campaign through a special assessment. The campaign is focused on areas of opportunity; unless you spend time in states like North Carolina, Texas, or Louisiana, you won't see these advertisements. There will be a tool kit available that will be suitable for use by any university, and our communications and marketing team is standing by to amplify the messages. We were also encouraged to reach out to our alumni in the targeted states and ask them to keep an eye out for this campaign.

Yesterday I saw a preview of a terrific new website we are launching featuring GW research as a way of communicating the value, impact, and variety of research underway at GW. We are joining many universities in telling these important stories and asserting the value of higher education. Please watch for an announcement in GW Today next week about the launch of this site.

## **Admissions and Fall 2025 Enrollment Update**

There have been many national stories about changes in various student enrollment trends this year. Overall, our early enrollment indicators reflect positively on the strength of our academic programs, the dedication of our admissions and enrollment teams, and the appeal of our university experience to outstanding undergraduate and graduate students. As usual, we will continue to monitor trends closely this summer and adapt our strategies as needed to meet our enrollment and institutional goals, but I wanted to provide a few highlights of the early trend data.

### **Undergraduate Enrollment**

I'm pleased to report that undergraduate enrollment patterns have remained relatively steady throughout this spring. New student admissions and returning student registration processes have progressed as planned. We again attracted over 27,000 applications from highly talented students across all 50 US states and more than 150 countries. We had over 5,000 admitted students and their family members come to campus in April to see the Only at GW experience firsthand.

As of today, our first-year and new transfer student profile is very strong and the new student deposits are in line with our enrollment targets. We will continue to manage the incoming class by leveraging transfer admissions and proactively using limited waitlist offers to shape and complete the class over the summer.

Undergraduate student retention rates are also on track, and early Fall 2025 registrations are slightly ahead of this time last year.

### **Graduate Enrollment**

In February, we highlighted our expanded national and global outreach strategies to strengthen the graduate applicant pools. I'm proud to share that those efforts have paid off—we exceeded our goal by attracting more than 27,500 new graduate student applications. While applications and admission patterns vary across schools and degree programs, this overall result is a strong indicator of our growing appeal in a very competitive graduate education marketplace.

Total new graduate student deposits are currently tracking slightly below last year's pace (-1% to -3% or 124 fewer new graduate student deposits compared to last year). This is primarily attributed to fewer early deposits from international students.

Based on historical trends and current engagement levels, there will be a lot of activity over the next three months. We expect around 1,800 additional new graduate student commitments between now and the start of September.

### **Monitoring International Student Markets**

Given the ongoing economic, political, and environmental uncertainties affecting international travel and planning, our enrollment and international services teams are keeping a close watch on international student trends. Our teams are actively working to support our global students through visa processes, communication touchpoints, and transition resources. Through all of our outreach and support efforts, our teams are focusing on GW's commitment to helping our international students fulfill their goal of joining us this fall and letting them know we are prepared to assist them as much as possible to help them succeed.

Now I would like to update you on some key planning processes.

## **Strategic Framework**

Thank you for your continued engagement and thoughtful insights on GW's Strategic Framework process, which was released for public review last month. We hosted nine leadership briefings, including with the Faculty Senate as well as the Board of Trustees, Student Government Association, Staff Council, and division and community leaders. We also hosted five community briefings and solicited feedback via the strategic framework website. Feedback during this phase was robust, as it has been throughout the process.

We received very positive feedback, with several great suggestions for strengthening the final framework. The community encouraged us to build on and expand the framework's bold ideas, clarify how the goals will be implemented, and ensure the framework remains grounded in academic excellence, cross-campus collaboration, and long-term impact. We plan to present a final draft to the Board of Trustees for review with approval at the retreat in June.

## **Campus Master Plan Update**

Another major planning effort underway is the Campus Master Plan. The current Foggy Bottom campus master plan spanned 20 years, and it will expire in 2027. Sasaki Associates has been selected as our design/planning partner and will also be leading our Campus Space Utilization Study. The internal engagement strategy is being developed, with the formation of a number of committees to provide guidance and input. The Campus Master Planning Steering Committee is helping guide this effort and includes a number of stakeholders from across GW, including faculty.

The overall schedule for the plan's development will last about two years. In 2025, we will focus on internal engagement and plan development. The focus will shift to city engagement and plan approval in 2026, followed by implementation in 2027.

## **Marketing and Branding Refresh Update**

We are making significant progress on the brand refresh initiative, which is closely tied to our work on the strategic framework. This work aims to strengthen our ability to tell the university's story and further enhance the university's reputation. Our agency partner, Ologie, has completed discovery interviews with more than 70 stakeholders ranging from trustees, university leadership, deans, faculty, students, alumni, and staff. We are gathering input from the entire GW community and have thus far received more than 1,600 responses. We have also established a 40+ person working group that is providing feedback at every stage of our efforts. In the near future, Ologie will begin testing various positioning statements in focus groups that will serve as the foundation of our messaging and creative approach.

The fourth planning element, which I'll just mention briefly, but which Provost Bracey will talk more about, is the Budget Model Redesign on which we are making good progress.

## **Engagements and Events**

In April, we installed Professor Mary Anne Franks as the Eugene L. and Barbara A. Bernard Professor in Intellectual Property, Technology, and Civil Rights Law.

InnovationFest was held on May 1; I visited the event and was very impressed—I also signed up for my AAAS membership. The Smith Center was filled with more than 150 scholars and inventors from all 10 schools. The participating students were especially impressive; a few presentations that stood out to me included the Columbian College of Arts & Sciences' Mind Brain Institute (with matched life-size brain models), the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences' Assistive Robotics and Tele-Medicine (ART-Med) Lab, and a product that makes central line insertions much safer—this was a collaboration among faculty, clinicians, and students in the School of Medicine & Health Sciences. My thanks and congratulations to Bob Miller and the team that put this remarkable event together.

One of the highlights of the year for me has been meeting with faculty over coffee and lunch. Open conversations like these are vitally important to encourage communication that will allow us to track and manage concerns and issues at this time of change. These featured both tenured and untenured faculty; I have learned a great deal about what it is like to manage teaching, research, scholarship, and sometimes patient care at GW, especially in this contested time.

Several positive actions have come out of these coffees, the most visible of which is the weekly federal update, the idea for which arose during one of these events. These conversations have been of the major highlights of my experience leading GW, and I am looking forward to continuing these in the fall.

Next, my thanks to those of you involved in the selection process for the Humanitarian Internship Program. Last month, we held a reception to celebrate the inaugural cohort of students participating in the Humanitarian Internship Program. We received 176 applicants for a cohort of 20, with 11 undergrads and 9 graduate students. The students represented the Elliott School (10), the Milken Institute School of Public Health (3), Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (6), and the School of Engineering & Applied Sciences (1). The program includes eight partner organizations, including Jubilee Housing (which serves the District) as well as World Central Kitchen, Engineers Without Borders, and others.

Finally, some news from the community:

- The Cedar Hill hospital ribbon cutting was held on April 10, with the official opening on April 15.
- I recently had lunch with DC Fire and EMS Chief John Donnelly as part of my efforts to get to know the city's leadership.

Commencement is upcoming on May 18, and I look forward to seeing many of you there.

Again, I want to welcome new senators. I hope you all have a great summer, and I look forward to working with you over the next academic year.



**Faculty Senate  
Provost Bracey Report  
May 9, 2025**

Good afternoon! It's hard to believe we are already at the end of the academic year.

As provost, my calendar at the end of the academic year is very busy, to put it mildly. But that is because, like President Granberg, I have the distinct privilege of being invited to many events that showcase the incredible accomplishments of our scholarly community. A few recent examples:

- The Academic Honors ceremony for undergraduate students, where we recognized 225 Outstanding Academic Achievement Awardees as well as Distinguished Scholars across eight schools.
- The 15<sup>th</sup> Annual Faculty Honors Ceremony, which was a milestone year. Our continued commitment to this event is our statement about the depth of our faculty and graduate student talent and our pride in the significant contributions of those individuals who bolster our reputation and drive our institution forward.
- Our highly impressive inaugural InnovationFest just last week, which showcased the breadth and depth of GW Research. You also may have noticed that members of our community were also able to register for their free AAAS membership at InnovationFest, thanks to GW's new AAAS Institutional Membership, which we recently announced.
- And of course, graduation events like Athletics Commencement for our athletes who will be competing during Commencement on the National Mall, and the Phi Beta Kappa Honors Society induction ceremony, which has particular meaning for me as I am a Phi Beta Kappa member!

Though we are all pulled in many different directions at once at this point in the semester, I am energized by seeing our academic community come together to celebrate all we have accomplished this year in our classrooms, labs or other research spaces, internships, and more, culminating in Commencement on the National Mall on Sunday, May 18. I look forward to seeing you all there and celebrating the Class of 2025.

Now, onto a few items of business.

Spring Grades

A quick housekeeping note on spring grades that you all likely know well. 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.

## Budget Model Redesign

As you know, the budget model redesign process continues, and we are in the midst of engaging faculty and staff in a series of virtual community conversations about the redesign, the guiding principles, and the road ahead. We hosted conversations yesterday and today, and there is one remaining on Monday at 4pm. Please go to the budget model website if you are interested in registering to attend.

## Policy Review Process

In March, we shared with the community four policies prompted for review by the voluntary resolution agreement entered into with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights. These policies were:

- Equal Opportunity, Nondiscrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Non-Retaliation Policy
- Demonstrations Policy (including the related policy on Barring People from Campus)
- Poster Policy

The policies were posted on the Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Risk site, and community members had through April 18 to review proposed changes and provide feedback.

We received many pieces of feedback on the policies, for which we are deeply appreciative. Now, we are actively working to organize the feedback and distill it into a thematic summary as well as finalize the policies themselves and prepare them for dissemination to the community. We expect to share the thematic summary and final versions of the policies in a communication in the coming weeks.

At the same time, the university announced that, based on what we would learn from this policy review, it would begin developing a permanent process for engaging the GW community about the development of new policies or revisions to current policies. This procedure was developed over several months in close coordination with the Faculty Senate, Student Government Association, and Staff Council, and I am pleased to share that this policy development process has been finalized. Next week, the community will receive an infomail with this information. I understand that the Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom committee has a lingering concern about the process, but I believe we have addressed all other issues related to the process.

## Middle States

In mid-April, we distributed an infomail sharing a link to the new Middle States accreditation self-study webpage on the Provost website. It shares initial information with the community about the self-study process, including Steering Committee and working group membership, the self-study timeline, and initial FAQs. There will be additional opportunities for engagement with this process in the months to come, so stay tuned.

## GWALA Cohort 6 Nominations

The nomination process for Cohort 6 of the GW Academic Leadership Academy is now open. You will find that information on the GWALA website. Please feel free to nominate someone for the program or nominate yourself! Nominations are due by the end of May, so don't wait.

### Dean Michael Feuer

Now, this is the final Faculty Senate meeting for several of our colleagues who are stepping back from their decanal roles this summer, and I would like to take a moment to briefly acknowledge them here.

Michael Feuer will conclude his tenure as dean of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development on July 1, a role he has held for 15 years. Under his leadership, GSEHD made significant strides, including the development and expansion of academic offerings, the refinement of a premier faculty body, and many new partnerships and collaborations, from the local to the global. After he steps down, Dean Feuer will remain a tenured full professor of education, so don't worry – he isn't going anywhere. He intends to continue advancing a number of the initiatives and activities he began as dean. He has been a deeply valued member of my senior leadership team, and I am very grateful for his continued service at our university.

Thank you, Michael.

### Dean Lynn Goldman

Lynn Goldman's 15-year term as Michael and Lori Milken Dean of Public Health will end on June 30. The Milken Institute School of Public Health transformed under Dean Goldman's leadership, including rising in the national rankings from 19<sup>th</sup> place in 2010 to 11<sup>th</sup> place in 2024, growing its endowment by nearly \$130 million, and creating seven new academic doctoral programs. Dean Goldman was also a key leader in GW and the District's public health response. We are very fortunate that she will remain a tenured member of our faculty and continue her excellent work, and I am deeply appreciative for her valued perspective on my senior leadership team and her many years of transformative service to GW.

Thank you, Lynn.

### Interim Dean Perry

Last but certainly not least, Interim Dean Vanessa Perry will conclude her tenure this summer when our new dean of the School of Business, Sevin Yeltekin, begins her role August 1. As you know, Interim Dean Perry has served tirelessly in this role since the departure of Dean Anuj Mehrotra. I am grateful to Interim Dean Perry for her strong and steady leadership, which has enabled the school to continue on its exciting trajectory during this transitional period. She has been a valuable addition to my senior leadership team, and I look forward to our continued work together as she supports the School of Business in her multiple other administrative and faculty capacities.

Thank you, Vanessa.

### School of Public Health Dean Search

Finally, a quick word on the status of two of these school leadership roles.

As you know, the Milken Institute School of Public Health search committee began its work in January, and the search firm conducted a site visit and stakeholder listening tour. In February, public health faculty approved the position description, and active recruitment for the position began. Interviews are ongoing, and we aim to name a new dean this summer.

## GSEHD Leadership

Regarding leadership of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, I have been in conversation with Dean Feuer and several faculty members on this topic. I will share information about interim GSEHD leadership as it is available.

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



## Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)  
May 9, 2025

### **FSEC Activities**

FSEC met on April 25, arranging the agenda for today's Senate meeting and receiving updates on Senate standing committee activities.

The President spoke about federal actions impacting higher education, including the evolving nature of the field under a very broad order that is impacting all aspects of the sector. She also provided updates on processes around the strategic planning framework (including the marketing and branding study), the new budget model, and campus planning.

The Provost reviewed the federal administration's recent executive order on higher education accreditors and the challenges this poses for GW as it enters its Middle States reaccreditation process. He also discussed the recent virtual seminar on institutional neutrality and plans to further engage the community on this question.

FSEC discussed topics for its upcoming joint meeting with the Board of Trustees Executive Committee.

The executive committee reviewed the Senate standing committee chairships and rosters, which will be voted on by the Senate today. The executive committee also determined its standing committee liaison assignments for the 2025-2026 session.

FSEC met to discuss a second tenure-and-promotion nonconcurrence and has delivered its recommendation on the case to the Provost.

### **In Memoriam**

As many of you have no doubt learned by now, longtime Senate Parliamentarian and Law School Professor Steve Charnovitz passed away in March. Steve served as the Senate Parliamentarian for 13 years, providing careful, reasoned advice to the Senate—including his repeated reminders that there is no such thing as a “friendly amendment.” Steve was also an accomplished and highly respected scholar, and his sharp intellect and wit will be very much missed at GW. Please join me in a moment of silence in Steve's memory.

### **Personnel Actions**

There is one active grievance at the university; the parties are in mediation.

## **Calendar**

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is August 22, 2025. Draft resolutions and any other possible Senate agenda items should be forwarded to Liz Carlson in the Senate office as soon as possible, ideally by August 15, 2025. The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting is September 12, 2025.



# Faculty Senate

## FACULTY SENATE CALENDAR<sup>1</sup>

2025-2026 Academic Year

## FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS<sup>2</sup>

2:00-4:30pm ~ Fall 2025: TBD ~ Spring 2026: 1957 E Street/State Room (7<sup>th</sup> floor) and/or via Zoom

May 9, 2025  
September 12, 2025  
October 17, 2025  
November 14, 2025  
December 12, 2025  
January 16, 2026  
February 13, 2026  
March 6, 2026  
April 17, 2026  
May 8, 2026<sup>3</sup>

---

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS<sup>4</sup>

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

August 22, 2025  
October 3, 2025  
October 31, 2025  
November 21, 2025  
December 19, 2025  
January 30, 2026  
February 27, 2026  
March 27, 2026  
April 24, 2026

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> First meeting of the 2026-2027 Academic Year session

<sup>4</sup> The Executive Committee may hold Special Meetings as convened by the Chair.

**Faculty Senate  
Master Standing Committee List  
2025-2026 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. 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**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Voting Status</b>
<i>Hernandez, Patricia*</i> , Chair	CCAS	Voting
<i>Brinkerhoff, Jennifer*</i> , FSEC Liaison	ESIA	Voting
Badie, Sameh*	SEAS	Voting
Bamford, Heather*	CCAS	Voting
Belenky, Masha*	CCAS	Voting
Clayton, Jennifer	GSEHD	Voting
de le Feunte, Maria-Jose	CCAS	Voting
Ganjoo, Rohini	SMHS/SEAS	Voting
Ghaedi, Mohammad	CCAS/ESIA	Voting
Harizanov, Valentina	CCAS	Voting
Hayes, Carol	CCAS	Voting
Hogg, Cameron	SON	Voting
Howard, Lionel	GSEHD	Voting
Jayaseelan, Dhinu	SMHS	Voting
Khilji, Shaista	GSEHD	Voting
Le, Daisy	SON	Voting
Lu, Luyao	SEAS	Voting
Merluzzi, Jennifer*	GWSB	Voting
Minor, Sabrina	VP HRMD, CPO	Nonvoting
Mylonas, Harris*	ESIA	Voting
Nasser, Samar	SMHS	Voting
Riffat, Rumana	VPFA	Nonvoting
Roberson, Anthony	SON	Voting
Singh, Anita	LAW	Voting
Talegawkar, Sameera	GWSPH	Voting
Tekleselassie, Abe	GSEHD	Voting
Wirtz, Phil*	GWSB	Voting
Young, Heather	GWSPH	Voting
Zderic, Vesna	SEAS	Voting

---

### Athletics & Recreation

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Voting Status</b>
<i>Mylonas, Harris, Co-Chair</i>	CCAS	Voting
<i>Wei, Peng, Co-Chair</i>	SEAS	Voting
<i>Keiff, Scott, FSEC Liaison</i>	LAW	Voting
Cassar, Linda	SON	Voting
Chung, Sunghun	GWSB	Voting
Barron, Mary	GWSPH	Voting
Cardman, Erin Anne	CCAS	Voting
Coleman, Colette	Provost, Dean of Students	Nonvoting
Ellman, Danya	Athletics	Nonvoting
Gray, Stephen	SMHS	Voting
Jayaseelan, Dhinu	SMHS	Voting
Johnson, Trig	CCAS (PT)	Voting
Lesley-Drakeford, Mya	CCAS staff	Voting
Levers, Kyle	SPH	Voting
Lipitz, Michael	Athletics	Nonvoting
McHugh, Patrick	GWSB	Voting
Mermelstein, Mark	Recreation	Nonvoting
Murray, Donal	SMHS	Voting
Padovano, Cara	SON	Voting
Quinlan, Scott	SPH	Voting
Singh, Anita	LAW	Voting
Spencer, Mark	SMHS	Voting
Teri, Ivan	GWSPH	Voting
Tuckwiller, Beth	GSEHD	Voting
Woodie, Lauren	SMHS	Voting
Young, Heather	SPH	Voting
TBD	NCAA FAR	Nonvoting

---

### Educational Policy & Technology

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Voting Status</b>
<i>Cohen-Cole, Jamie*, Chair</i>	CCAS	Voting
<i>Choate, Thomas, Co-Chair</i>	GWSB	Voting
<i>Badie, Sameh*, FSEC Liaison</i>	SEAS	Voting
Anderson, Suse	CCAS	Voting
Baharu, Yordanos	LAI	Nonvoting
Bauer, Kelly	CCAS	Voting
Beveridge, Scott	GSEHD	Voting
Brand, Jeff	Provost	Nonvoting
Bronner, Ben	GWSB	Voting
Clarkson, Chante	Student Success	Nonvoting

Cloud, Katie	Registrar	Nonvoting
Culbreath, André	CCAS staff	Nonvoting
Dent, Alex	CCAS	Voting
DiSimone, Alyssa	SEAS	Voting
Ensor, Brian	GWIT	Nonvoting
Feuer, Michael	GSEHD	Nonvoting
Foster, Irene	CCAS	Voting
Frierson, Tobe	Enrollment	Nonvoting
Froslid-Jones, Karen	Assessment	Nonvoting
Goff, Jay	Enrollment	Nonvoting
Goldfrank, Joe	SEAS	Voting
Hancock, Adrienne	CCAS	Voting
Henry, Geneva	Provost, LAI	Nonvoting
Johnson, Candice	SMHS	Nonvoting
Johnson, Jared	GWIT	Nonvoting
Kern, Michael	GWIT	Nonvoting
Knestrick, Joyce	SON	Voting
Knudsen, Kevin	LAI	Nonvoting
Lipinski, Lisa	CCAS	Voting
Lotrecchiano, Guy	SMHS	Voting
Murphy, Terry	Provost	Nonvoting
Nasser, Samar	SMHS	Voting
Price, Marie	CCAS/ESIA	Voting
Quinlan, Scott	GWSPH	Voting
Rain, David*	CCAS	Voting
Riedner, Rachel	CCAS	Nonvoting
Rossetti, Michael	LAI	Nonvoting
Schultheiss, Katrin*	CCAS	Voting
Schwartz, Lisa	SMHS	Voting
Siczek, Megan	CCAS	Voting
Singer-Freedman, Karen	Teaching & Learning Excellence	Nonvoting
Singh, Anita	LAW	Voting
Smith, Andrew	CCAS	Voting
Subramaniam, Suresh	Provost	Nonvoting
Toll, Ben	Admissions	Nonvoting
Torres, Jason	LAI	Nonvoting
Trammel, Shauntae	GWIT	Nonvoting
Ulfers, Margaret	GWSPH	Voting
Wagner, Sarah	CCAS	Voting
Williams, Kimberley	Student Success	Nonvoting
Wirtz, Phil*	GWSPH	Voting
Young, Heather	GWSPH	Voting
Zakai, Orian	CCAS	Voting

---

## Fiscal Planning & Budgeting

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Voting Status</b>
<i>Kulp, Susan*, Chair</i>	GWSB	Voting
<i>Cordes, Joe, Co-Chair</i>	CCAS	Voting
<i>Akman, Jeff*, FSEC Liaison</i>	SMHS	Voting
Ali, Neena	University Controller	Nonvoting
Bakshi, Hemant	Senior Associate VP	Nonvoting
Birkmeier, Marisa	SMHS	Voting
Bosque, Alberto	SMHS	Voting
Boutwell, Sarah	SMHS	Voting
Chalasani, Pavani	SMHS	Voting
Choate, Thomas	GWSB	Voting
Clausen, Michelle	SMHS	Voting
Cohen-Cole, Jamie*	CCAS	Voting
Crandall, Keith*	SPH	Voting
DeRaedt, Mary	GSEHD	Voting
Doering, Michael	CCAS	Voting
Fernandes, Bruno	Treasurer	Nonvoting
Flannery, Pamela	SMHS(PT)	Voting
Freund, Maxine	GSEHD	Nonvoting
Germani Matin, Ali	SEAS(PT)	Voting
Ghaedi, Mohammad	CCAS(PT)	Voting
Glatzer, Michael	Vice Provost Budget & Finance	Nonvoting
Gomberg-Maitland, Mardi	SMHS	Voting
Gore, Angela*	GWSB	Voting
Gray, Stephen	SMHS	Voting
Henry, Geneva	LAI	Nonvoting
Jaqua, Dan	CCAS	Voting
Kim, Mikyong	GSEHD	Voting
Knestrick, Joyce	SON	Voting
Koutroulis, Ioannis	SMHS	Voting
Li, Zhenyu	SEAS	Voting
Lu, Luyao	SEAS	Voting
Markus, Anne*	GWSPH	Voting
Mendelowitz, David*	SMHS	Voting
Morley, Brendan	CCAS	Voting
Murphy, Teresa	Provost	Nonvoting
Pak, Miok	CCAS	Voting
Parsons, Don	CCAS	Voting
Rigg, Siobhan*	CCAS	Voting
Rozenbaum, Oded	GWSB	Voting
Spear, Jo	ESIA	Voting
Warner, Mary	SMHS	Voting
Williams, Ben	CCAS	Voting
Wilson, Arthur*	GWSB	Voting

Wirtz, Phil*	GWSB	Voting
Yang, Lang (Kate)	CCAS	Voting
Yezer, Anthony	CCAS	Voting
Zeman, Bob	SMHS	Voting
Zhang, Xiaoke	CCAS	Voting

---

**Honors & Academic Convocations**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Voting Status</b>
<i>Schultheiss, Katrin*, Chair, FSEC Liaison</i>	CCAS	Voting
Abbruzzese, Jennifer	Provost's Office	Nonvoting
Benetiz-Curry, Barbara	CCAS	Voting
Cardman, Erin Anne	CCAS	Voting
Cox, Catherine	SON	Voting
Das, Bagmi	GSEHD	Voting
Dimri, Manjari	SMHS	Voting
Friedman, Leonard	GWSPH	Voting
Goodman, Karen	SMHS	Voting
Hegarty, Paul	Events	Nonvoting
Hogg, Cameron	SON	Voting
Hurst, Sarah-Kay	CCAS	Voting
Philips, Lauren	CCAS staff	Voting
Richman, Barak	LAW	Voting
Riffat, Rumana	VPFA	Nonvoting
Ritsema, Tamara	SMHS	Voting
Solichin, Muhammad	SEAS	Voting
Wadhwa, Anju	GWSB	Voting
Yakushko, Oksana	CCAS/ESIA	Voting

---

**Libraries**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Voting Status</b>
<i>Schwindt, Rhonda*</i> , Chair, FSEC Liaison	SON	Voting
<i>Dugan, Holly</i> , Co-chair	CCAS	Voting
Abate, Laura	SMHS	Nonvoting
Belenky, Masha*	CCAS	Voting
Chen, Liana	CCAS/ESIA	Voting
Chung, Sunghun	GWSB	Voting
Das, Bagmi	GSEHD	Voting
Dolgova, Natalia	CCAS	Voting
Feldman, Ilana	ESIA	Voting
Frenchette, John	GWSB (PT)	Voting
Gayton, Cynthia	SEAS (PT)	Voting
Ghaedi, Mohammad	CCAS (PT)	Voting
Henry, Geneva	LAI	Nonvoting
Murray, Donal	SMHS	Voting
Pagel, Scott	Law Library	Nonvoting
Patel, Ashesh	SMHS	Voting
Posey, Laurie	SON	Voting
Puskarz, Katherine	GWSC/GWSPH	Nonvoting
Scalzitti, David	SMHS	Voting
Spear, Jo	ESIA	Voting
Thoma, Kathleen	SMHS	Voting
White, Scott*	CPS	Voting

---

**Physical Facilities & Campus Safety**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Voting Status</b>
<i>Markus, Anne*</i> , Chair	GWSPH	Voting
<i>Traub, John</i> , Co-Chair	CCAS	Voting
<i>Eakle, Jonathan*</i> , FSEC Liaison	GSEHD	Voting
Aaronson, Adam	FPCM	Nonvoting
Bamdad, Michael	CCAS	Voting
Clark, Russell	CPS (PT)	Voting
Cloud, Katie	Registrar	Nonvoting
Coleman, Colette	Dean of Students	Nonvoting
Crawford, Douglas	CCAS	Voting
Goodly, Baxter	Safety & Operations	Nonvoting
Gray, Stephen	SMHS	Voting
Greenlee, Ian	GWPD	Nonvoting
Hurst, Sarah-Kay	CCAS	Voting
Kowalczyk, Barbara	Food Safety Ins.	Voting
Levers, Kyle	GWSPH	Voting
Mahshie, James	CCAS	Voting
McCarthy, Eli	CCAS (PT)	Voting
McDonald, Katie	Campus Safety	Nonvoting
Morley, Brendan	CCAS	Voting
Murphy, Terry	Provost	Nonvoting
Pagel, Scott	LAW	Voting
Psek, Wayne	GWSPH	Voting
Serrano, Pablo	SMHS	Voting
Shanley, Whitney	SON	Voting
Spencer, Marc	SMHS	Voting
Testor, Sharon	GWSC	Nonvoting
Wadhwa, Anju	GWSB	Voting
Weglicki, William	SMHS	Voting
Weinshel, Seth	Business Services	Nonvoting
White, Scott*	CPS	Voting
Wright, Dwayne	GSEHD	Voting
Zeman, Robert*	SMHS	Voting

---

**Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Voting Status</b>
<i>Callier, Shawneequa*</i> , Chair	SMHS	Voting
<i>Wright, Dwayne</i> , Co-Chair	GSEHD	Voting
Wilson, Arthur*, FSEC Liaison	GWSB	Voting
Anderson, Suse	CCAS	Voting
Anker, Elisabeth	CCAS	Voting
Asgary, Ramin	GWSPH/ESIA	Voting
Bamford, Heather*	CCAS	Voting
Clausen, Michelle	SMHS post-doc	Voting
Cohen-Cole, Jamie	CCAS	Voting
Cseh, Maria*	GSEHD	Voting
Darr, Kurt	SPH Emeritus	Voting
Deyo, Patricia	SON	Voting
El-Ghazawi, Tarek*	SEAS	Voting
Gore, Angela*	GWSB	Voting
Gutman, Jeffrey	LAW	Voting
Johnson, Karen	CCAS staff	Voting
Kimmel, Anna Jayne	CCAS	Voting
Kyriakopoulos, Nick	SEAS Emeritus	Voting
McAlister, Melani*	CCAS	Voting
Mosley, Karen	CCAS (PT)	Voting
Ndebele, Paul	GWSPH staff	Voting
Orti, Guillermo*	CCAS	Voting
Padovano, Cara	SON	Voting
Patel, Ashesh	SMHS	Voting
Potash, Jordan	CCAS	Voting
Prakash, Punit	SEAS	Voting
Price, Marie	CCAS/ESIA	Voting
Riffat, Rumana	VPFA	Nonvoting
Rigg, Siobhan*	CCAS	Voting
Seager, Jennifer	GWSPH	Voting
Vanderbilt, Sandra	GSEHD	Voting
Wald, Gayle	CCAS	Voting
Wargotz, Eric	SMHS	Voting
Wasserman, Alan	SMHS	Voting
Weitzner, Richard	OGC	Nonvoting
Whitt, Karen	SON	Voting

---

**Research**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Voting Status</b>
<i>Kay, Matt*</i> , Chair	SEAS	Voting
<i>McDonnell, Karen</i> , Co-Chair	GWSPH	Voting
<i>Warren, John*</i> , FSEC Liaison	CPS	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
Dowling, Maritza	SON/GWSPH	Voting
Downie, Evangeline	CCAS	Nonvoting
El-Ghazawi, Tarek*	SEAS	Voting
Engel, Laura*	GSEHD	Voting
Entcheva, Emilia	SEAS	Voting
Frechette, John	GWSB	Voting
Freund, Maxine	GSEHD	Nonvoting
Gillis, Bill	LAI	Nonvoting
Gomberg-Maitland, Mardi	SMHS	Voting
Hall, Alison	SMHS	Nonvoting
Hernandez, Patricia*	CCAS	Voting
Hyder, Adnan	GWSPH	Nonvoting
Kimmel, Anna Jayne	CCAS	Voting
Liu, Cindy	GWSPH	Voting
Lohr, Gina	Provost	Nonvoting
Magnus, Manya	GWSPH	Voting
Mallinson, Trudy	SMHS	Nonvoting
Mendelowitz, David*	SMHS	Voting
Miller, Robert	SMHS, Provost	Nonvoting
Pintz, Christine	SON	Nonvoting
Shirrell, Matthew	GSEHD	Voting
Subramaniam, Suresh	Provost	Nonvoting
Wallington, Sherrie	SON	Voting
Wei, Peng	SEAS	Voting
Yang, Jiawen	GWSB	Nonvoting
Yeung, Ellen	CCAS	Voting
Zhang, Grace	SEAS	Nonvoting

---

**University & Urban Affairs**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Voting Status</b>
<i>Rain, David*</i> , Chair	CCAS	Voting
<i>Ward, Maranda</i> , Co-chair	SMHS	Voting
<i>Vyas, Amita*</i> , FSEC Liaison	GWSPH	Voting
Adetunji, Oluwatomi	SEAS	Voting
Batra, Sonal	SMHS	Voting
Boutwell, Sarah	SMHS	Voting
Cha, Jihae	GSEHD	Voting
Cheh, Mary*	LAW	Voting
Cohen, Amy	CCAS	Voting
Das, Bagmi	GSEHD	Voting
Davidson, Leslie	SMHS	Voting
DeSimone, Alyssa	SEAS	Voting
DiSilva, Joshua	CCAS	Voting
Dortch, Deniece	GSEHD	Voting
Fitzpatrick, Lisa	GWSPH	Voting
Goodman, Karen	SMHS	Voting
Hines, Aris	GWSB (PT)	Voting
Hoar, Sandy	GWSPH	Voting
Howard, Lionel	GSEHD	Voting
Magyar, Matthew	SMHS	Voting
McPhatter, Renee	Gov't & Community Rel.	Nonvoting
Migliaccio, Eugene	GWSPH	Voting
Mosley, Karen	CCAS (PT)	Voting
Onumah, Chavon	SMHS	Voting
Padovano, Cara	SON	Voting
Philip, Naomi	Naval Sci.	Voting
Prakash, Punit	SEAS	Voting
Sawyer, Kellie	SMHS	Voting
Sudarshan, Sawali	SMHS	Voting
Thessin, Rebecca	GSEHD	Voting
Vanderbilt, Sandra	GSEHD	Voting
Walsh, Jennifer	SON/SMHS	Voting
Wentzell, Erin	SMHS	Voting
Wilensky, Sara	GWSPH	Voting
Wilson, Arthur*	GWSB	Voting
Wright, Dwayne	GSEHD	Voting
Zink, Christy	CCAS	Voting

\*faculty senator or delegate

**Dispute Resolution Committee  
2025-2026**

---

**Joan Schaffner, Chair**

---

**May 2023-April 2026**

---

Cheh, Mary	LAW	Law
Friedman, Leonard	GWSPH	Health Policy & Management
Garris, Charles	SEAS	Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
Schwindt, Rhonda	SON	Nursing
Stein, Mary Beth	CCAS	RGSL

**May 2024-April 2027**

---

Bukrinsky, Michael	SMHS	Microbiology, Immunology, & Tropical Medicine
Carrillo, Arturo	LAW	Law
Le, Daisy	SON	Nursing
Schultheiss, Katrin	CCAS	History
Vyas, Amita	GWSPH	Prevention & Community Health

**May 2025-April 2028**

---

Badie, Sameh	SEAS	Civil & Environmental Engineering
Bailey, James	GWSB	Management
Cseh, Maria	GSEHD	Human & Organizational Learning
Packer, Randall	CCAS	Biological Sciences
Pelzman, Joseph	ESIA	Economics, International Affairs, & Law

**Student Discrimination Report Committee  
2025-2026 Roster**

Bradley, Faith	GWSB
Brinkerhoff, Jennifer	ESIA
Cassar, Linda	SON
Core, Cynthia	CCAS
Grover, Jennifer	SMHS
Kim, Immanuel	CCAS
Parker, Maggie	GSEHD
Sawyer, Kellie	SMHS
Traub, John	CCAS
Zysmilich, Martin	CCAS