



# Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, September 12, 2025, at 2:00pm  
in MPA 309 (805 21<sup>st</sup> Street NW) and via Zoom

## **AGENDA**

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the [minutes](#) of the following meetings:
  - May 9, 2025 (regular meeting)
  - August 12, 2025 (special meeting open session)
  - August 12, 2025 (special meeting executive session—minutes were circulated securely via Box with those in attendance and are not posted to the Senate website)
3. [Resolution 26/1](#): Of Appreciation for Christopher Alan Bracey (Scott Kieff, Faculty Senate Executive Committee)
4. Introductions (Ellen Granberg, President)
  - John Lach (Interim Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs)
  - David Unruh (Vice President for University Advancement)
  - Victor Brito (Chief of Police)
  - Sevin Yeltekin (Dean, GW School of Business)
  - Lionel Howard (Interim Dean, Graduate School of Education & Human Development)
  - Jason Zara (Interim Dean, School of Engineering & Applied Sciences)
  - Emily Hammond (Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs)
5. President's & Provost's Reports (Ellen Granberg, President, and John Lach, Interim Provost)
  - Brief Statements and Questions/President's & Provost's Reports
6. Executive Committee Report (Katrin Schultheiss, Chair)
  - Brief Statements and Questions/Executive Committee Report
  - Compiled questions from the Senate committees to the administration ([see attached](#))
  - Prioritized questions from the compiled list shared with President Granberg Sept 4 ([see attached](#))
7. [Resolution 26/2](#): On Prioritizing Education at GW (Jamie Cohen-Cole, Co-Chair, Educational Policy & Technology Committee)
8. Introduction of New Resolutions to be Referred to Committee
9. General Business
  - a) Nominations for standing committee membership ([see attached](#))
  - b) Standing committee reports received
10. Brief Statements and Questions/General
11. Adjournment



**A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR PROVOST AND  
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT CHRISTOPHER ALAN BRACEY (26/1)**

**WHEREAS**, Christopher Alan Bracey has served with great distinction as the Provost and Executive Vice President of the George Washington University since 2021; and

**WHEREAS**, Professor Bracey, after selection by GW Presidents and Trustees, with broad approbation of his faculty peers across the GW community, through his service as Provost and Executive Vice President, has displayed extraordinary wisdom, skill, talent, perseverance, hard work, transparency, kindness, good humor, and leadership in steering GW through a difficult transition, earning the trust of the faculty, students, staff, and trustees because of his collaborative problem-solving approach; and

**WHEREAS**, Provost Bracey has recruited and appointed an outstanding senior leadership team for the George Washington University academic community, including helping to recruit an acting President and President, and has launched three major university-wide research institutes, each of which will have significant lasting positive impact on GW; and

**WHEREAS**, Provost Bracey has collaborated closely with the Faculty Senate in formulating a wide range of University policies, from a strategic plan and strategic framework to a new budget model and entry into the prestigious Association of American Universities, all of which have had significant lasting positive impact on GW; and

**WHEREAS**, Provost Bracey has made seminal contributions in promoting the benefits of effective shared governance among the Faculty, the Administration, and the Board of Trustees which will serve as an enduring model of exemplary academic administration at GW; and

**WHEREAS**, Provost Bracey has earned the highest level of respect, gratitude, and admiration among the Faculty and the entire GW 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 Professor Bracey for his devoted and highly effective service to the Faculty and the University.

That this Resolution of Appreciation be appropriately inscribed and conveyed to Professor Bracey, with a copy to be included in the official minutes of the September 12, 2025, meeting of the Faculty Senate.

**THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY HEREBY  
EXPRESSES ITS DEEPEST ADMIRATION, APPRECIATION, AND GRATITUDE  
TO PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT CHRISTOPHER ALAN BRACEY  
FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP.**



**A RESOLUTION ON PRIORITIZING EDUCATION AT GW (26/2)**

**WHEREAS,** The George Washington University (GW) is working in an environment with its budget under pressure and with expenses outpacing revenue;<sup>1</sup>

**WHEREAS,** in 2020 the university leadership decided to hire and then made payments to Gallup through 2024 to conduct an expensive survey, called “My Voice at GW”;

**WHEREAS,** the faculty were not consulted about running a Gallup survey;

**WHEREAS,** the survey in the past asked fairly generic questions about workplace satisfaction (e.g., “Do you have a best friend at work?”) and does not appear designed to identify challenges or opportunities specific to GW or universities more generally;

**WHEREAS,** the GW faculty includes experts in survey design in its extensive social science, business, and other departments of the university, many of whom would be willing to help design surveys that would be more tailored to our university and therefore more useful for university leadership;

**WHEREAS,** the use of internal expertise would likely require the university to pay no costs;

**WHEREAS,** reliance on internal, already available resources is a more responsible approach to the stewardship of the university in comparison to expensive external consulting agreements; and

**WHEREAS,** the funds provided to external contractors are better used to advance other priorities of the university leadership, such as the university’s educational mission and other priorities described by the Strategic Framework;

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

1. Recommends, in the service of transparency, that university leadership share the cost of the Gallup engagement with the GW community;
2. Recommends prioritizing student and instructional needs in budgeting decisions;
3. Recommends that GW rely on in-house faculty and staff expertise to conduct surveys rather than on Gallup; and
4. Recommends that the university leadership more generally consider the use of in-house faculty and staff expertise rather than expensive consultants in other areas as well.

Educational Policy & Technology Committee  
September 5, 2025

---

<sup>1</sup> Faculty Senate Budget Update, August 12, 2025



## Faculty Senate

### Nominees for Standing Committee Membership

September 2025

#### Appointment, Salaries, & Promotion Policies

Emily Hammond (Interim VPFA), nonvoting

#### Athletics and Recreation

Elizabeth Choma (SON), voting

Kieran Laffey (SGA), nonvoting

#### Educational Policy & Technology

Crystal DeVoss Mahany (CPS), voting

Eric Grynawiski (CCAS), voting

Ethan Lynne (SGA), nonvoting

Liz Stoddard (SGA), nonvoting

Sharon Testor-Bucher (Enrollment & Student Services), nonvoting

#### Honors & Academic Convocations

Emily Hammond (Interim VPFA), nonvoting

Jorey Reyes (SGA), nonvoting

#### Libraries

Grayson Lewis (SGA), nonvoting

#### Physical Facilities & Campus Safety

Victor V. Brito (GWPD), nonvoting

Nick Gingue (Campus Operations), nonvoting

#### Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom

Catherine Guttmann-McCabe (Equity & Title IX Compliance), nonvoting

Ashley Fountaine (Access & Opportunity), nonvoting

Emily Hammond (Interim VPFA), nonvoting

Malwina Huzarska (SMHS), voting

#### Research

Christopher Mores, (GWSPH Interim Sr. ADR), nonvoting

#### University & Urban Affairs

Peyton Gallant (SGA), nonvoting



## Questions Received for the 8.12.2025 Special Faculty Senate Meeting (compiled by the Senate Office without edits)

### A. Shared Governance:

1. What is the university's plan for engaging faculty in formulating austerity measures?
2. The communication strategy - the July message - was terrible, leading to confusion, outrage, and incredible amounts of work across the university. We are already very late in academic planning for THIS fall. The poorly worded message made it appear that departments could not hire TPTs and VAPs, and immediate, urgent curricular needs would be unmet. In the past, the President (Wrighton) and Provost (Bracey) would often solicit the views of committee chairs so as to make sure that such messages made sense to faculty, staff and students. This did not happen this time. The resulting message looks like it might be appealing to consultants or PR firms but set us back instead of forward by several weeks (and the absence of budgets means we are already months behind of the timetable we used to have pre-COVID). Is it possible to change our message practice to ensure that there are more eyes on these kinds of university-wide communication, so they are accurate? This particular message was often inaccurate and quite misleading.
3. Continuing on about our July message, other university presidents (e.g., USC) have planned extensive consultation with faculty groups, are transparent on university financial challenges, and are transparent about the effects of the medical enterprise on the financial health of the academic side of the university. The message sent by leadership does not suggest that the president or provost will brief the faculty in town halls, continues to not provide transparency on our financial challenges, and does not own up to the long term effect of the MFA on the university. In reality, our message appears to many faculty to be quite poor. To take one simple example, most university presidents are announcing the size of the pay cut they and their staff are taking. Faculty need to understand these issues. It's essential for morale and also forward looking academic planning for them to understand the nature and cause of our financial challenges. Why has leadership decided to release so little information at this time? Do you believe that the continued use of executive sessions in the Senate will compound these issues by further stovepiping information?
4. In the spring, EPT presented a resolution and report on transfer students. It (a) correctly surmised the importance of transfers to GW's near term financial health (our transfer population at the UG level doubled y/y) and (b) suggested a series of measures to further enhance this valuable pipeline, including changes to transfer processes and the creation of a working group to iron out curricular kinks. These kinks continue to exist, which will complicate life for the growing number of transfer students, and may prove an obstacle to continue to attract more as the market for transfer students is very likely to grow increasingly competitive. Does University Leadership now appreciate the arguments EPT made last year about the importance of transfers? Should we expect action on EPT's recommendations?

5. How will the university ensure ongoing transparency with faculty regarding the budget review process and final FY26 budget approval?
6. What formal mechanisms will be established for faculty inputs in future financial stability measures and strategic planning?
7. How will the university measure the success of these new measures, and when can faculty expect regular updates on their effectiveness and any adjustments to the plan?

B. Impacts on Students:

1. How are the student loan limitations impacting plans to raise tuition?
2. One way to enhance revenue is to increase retention - we get no tuition dollars from students who leave GW. EPT - led by Professors Wagner and Foster - focused a lot in the last 3-4 years on student services. There is a concern that the administration will cut support for proven retention related programs. In some cases, a dollar spent on retention may produce many additional dollars for tuition. Is the administration planning to study what programs have high efficacy in retaining students in advance of making cuts? If so, what does that process look like?

C. Impacts on Strategic Framework:

1. Given the immediate implementation of a hiring freeze and the likelihood of faculty and staff layoffs, how does the university realistically expect to launch and effectively implement the Strategic Framework (**From Strength to Strength: OneGW in its Third Century**) starting in fall 2025?
2. How will the university balance the recognition that "personnel growth cannot sustain the University" with any of the strategic framework's objectives that might require investment in new faculty expertise or staff support to achieve long-term goals?
3. The current strategic framework emphasizes the alignment of the GW community. How will the university maintain morale, engagement, and a sense of shared vision among faculty and staff during a period marked by hiring freezes and potential layoffs?
4. Are there any aspects of the Strategic Framework that will actively contribute to alleviating the university's financial challenges, for instance, through strategic initiatives focused on new revenue generation or philanthropic efforts?

D. Enrollment:

1. What are the specific anticipated effects of enrollment problems broken down by school?
2. How do you model graduate revenue? The reason I ask is that I study enrollment and there is a lot of variation, especially this year, in likely levels of summer melt. For example, some schools have triple digit numbers of students who have made deposits from markets that rarely produce significant numbers of students for GW. Within our own admissions groups, we have reasonably reliable methods of estimating the likely number of students who we can yield from these markets (no model is perfect of course). How do you model graduate revenue, especially from high-melt markets?
3. In the spring, the Senate heard a report from Jay Goff and another report (Core Indicators) by Provost Bracey that described no problems with enrollments for this AY. Neither referenced significant enrollment stress and suggested we were on track and all was well. In July, the situation had changed and now budgets are being slashed owing to problems including the enrollment cliff. How do you reconcile these very different public statements?
4. Before these presentations, the faculty were reporting within EPT the challenges described in the July email, especially as it pertains to graduate enrollment. These faculty were not invited to present their findings - which presaged the budget cut - because the Senate chose

to move into Executive Session. The optics are that leadership did not want the faculty to realize the full extent of the challenges or have someone challenge their findings. In the end, there was nothing secret in these challenges - they are the basis for the budget cuts. What has leadership learned about the problems with the absence of transparency by challenges in getting everyone on the same page?

5. Can the administration assure the faculty that discrepancy between the core indicators report and the current reflections on enrollment impacting the FY26 budget will not result in a future 990 showing a large severance package to those who were responsible for this lack of transparency and poor planning?
6. EPT has had several special meetings on the use of the Vern, and especially the need to grow LLCs to improve recruitment and the student experience, with an eye toward retention. EPT is excited that the administration has followed its advice, creating new opt-in LLCs (Sustainability and Food). However, a core principle in those discussions is that new LLCs located on the Vern need to match GW's student profile. Creating programs to do not fit with our students' interests will consume resources and time and not prove an effective recruitment tool. One example is Harvest House, which is administered by the Global Food Institute. Very few students have expressed interest in these academic programs, so ex ante we would not find that this is likely to be a successful program. By contrast, sustainability is a closer match to GW's academic profile. Can you please tell us how many students enrolled in each community? How many were invited to participate in each (so we understand their yield)? And, whether there are lessons learned from this experience?

E. Overall budget questions/requests:

1. The committees would like to see more details about the budget situation including the impact of the MFA crisis, including disaggregated data so they can see which schools are running deficits and which are not.
  - They'd like to see the Central administration budget and actuals presented, with corresponding headcounts
  - They'd also appreciate seeing 5-year trends by unit (if possible), including central and its subunits (including athletics), and the margin for each school
2. When memo was sent, what was the anticipated deficit for FY 26 and how does this compare to FY 25?
3. Has the anticipated deficit changed since the memo?
4. Does this anticipated deficit assume that unit new requests are being honored or is this purely a reflection of hits to our revenue?
5. What is the current magnitude of the "growing structural deficit," and what is the comprehensive, long-term plan to address it beyond these immediate measures?
6. What do we anticipate the net tuition revenue being in FY 26 and what was it in FY 25?
7. What is the breakdown of the net revenue for FY 25 and FY 26 in terms of grad and undergrad? Other potential sources of revenue decline?
  - a. What does the housing revenue looking like?
  - b. What occupancy are we anticipating?
8. We heard in the President's report [to the Faculty Senate in May] about increasing costs that are outpacing revenues in the last few years. Do those costs include or not include the MFA?
9. The MFA. Faculty really want to know what is contributing to our challenges.
  - a. Are we still counting on the MFA making interest payments on the 400+ Million dollars that the MFA owes the university?

- b. What is the annual amount of those payments?
- c. What actually is the MFA's current debt to the university?
  - i. How much of this is FY2025 loans?
  - ii. How much new loan money is expected in FY2026
- d. Has the MFA's need to borrow money from the university eaten significantly into our cash reserves and if so, how much forgone interest is the MFA costing the university?
- 10. Are we anticipating every unit cutting expenses next year? If not, can you elaborate on what units are going to be spending more next year and why are these decisions being made?
  - a. In particular, how much more will we be spending on aid next year?
  - b. How much is the university spending on consultants?
  - c. How has this grown over the past few years?
  - d. How much are we anticipating having to spend to pay our student athletes next year?
- 11. Can you elaborate on where the large increases in expenses have been coming from?
- 12. Is our debt situation so bad that we are needing to borrow to cover operating expenses? If so, how much are we borrowing and at what rate?
- 13. Can you explain why the reports on our budget were pretty rosy as recently as the March fiscal planning committee meeting and then we learn in May that there are serious budget problems? Is this really this sudden of a discovery?
- 14. How confident are you in your revenue forecasting? This is being asked because during COVID the faculty were told one thing and then in the end the situation was much better.
- 15. What are the effects on university finances of high administrative costs?
- 16. What is the proportion of the university budget that is allocated to administrative costs? USNews 2023 private schools 27.4% (32.1% in 2010) of expenditures were allocated for instruction, 29.6% (23.7% in 2010) were for academic support, student support and institutional support.
- 17. Are there plans to reduce the size of GW's administrative structures?
- 18. What is the specific financial impact of federal cuts to research?
- 19. Many universities are not being reimbursed for work they have already done on federal grants. This is happening without announcement of grant cancellations. How much, if any, of this non-reimbursement is going on here and what is the budget impact if there is any of this going on?
- 20. Can the administration commit that athletics will have cuts to its budget at least as large as those hitting the colleges and the new Name Image and Licensing payments to athletes will derive only from new sources of revenue. (i.e. from people who have not donated before)
- 21. Given the impact of GW on the local economy, has there been further discussion regarding increasing the enrollment cap in Foggy Bottom to increase revenue, although that comes with other costs like housing?
- 22. What are the implications for strategic framework?
- 23. The Hatchet has been reporting that the university is going to be fully participating in the race to pay our basketball players. Is this true? It is clear from publicly available data that athletics has increased their spending a great deal over the past few years. Are we asking athletics to trim their budget? Can you tell us what athletics budget was in each of the last five years and what do we think it will be in fy 26?
- 24. Other schools in our market basket (e.g. NYU) have decided to be Division 3. What is the budget impact on GWU of us deciding to be Division 1?

25. The pre-COVID budget model contained significant incentives for schools to innovate, especially at the graduate level. By allowing schools to keep a significant share of graduate revenue, schools - and departments and faculty - were keen to generate profitable programs. Since COVID, the margins have effectively prevented schools from realizing any gains from innovation. From the department and individual faculty perspective, increasing graduate enrollment is therefore a burden - we have more work to do - and no incentive to take on those burdens, even at a school level. Do you have any plans to encourage innovation?
  26. GW has an enormous backlog of deferred maintenance projects. The challenge with deferred maintenance is that not doing it generates significant costs. The obvious example is water intrusion. If we do not regularly maintain building envelopes, we experience significant emergency expenses for damaged property, mold remediation, and disruption of campus operations. There are a wide range of recent examples where penny pinching on maintenance has led to dramatic growth in expenses. Rather than addressing this backlog, it appears like the capital budget is being used to purchase new buildings? Is that right? When you are modeling the gains from new acquisitions, are you including the costs associated with the lost opportunity to address critical deferred maintenance needs in existing buildings or the loss of revenue when students leave because their buildings are full of mold?
  27. Department of Health Care Finance has estimated that about one third of residents on Medicaid may lose access owing to changes at the federal level; about 100,000 DC residents. The Cedar Hill Hospital services primarily Wards 7 and 8, which have the highest percentage of Medicaid patients in the city ([https://dhcf.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dhcf/publication/attachments/Proposed%20Enrollment%20Template\\_Part%202.pdf](https://dhcf.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dhcf/publication/attachments/Proposed%20Enrollment%20Template_Part%202.pdf)). What is the plan that we have in place to contain costs given the almost certain loss of planned revenue at Cedar Hill?
  28. The Education department may miss its schedule for loan disbursements. People are being fired over there and the Department may cease to exist. What is our plan if federal loans are now paid in August, September, October, November?
  29. Faculty are increasingly concerned that undergraduate programs are being moved to Central and away from the schools. As we understand it, there is an undergraduate tuition cap. This means that there are a finite number of credit hours available to generate revenue from undergraduate students. Increasingly, Central is moving undergraduate tuition to the Provost Office by the formation of new minors, such as sustainability. It is also moving research away from schools and toward Central through the formation of new institutes (which thereby lose their connection to undergraduate education as they have no relationship to departments). This breaks the basic model of how undergraduate education works at GW, preventing department and school oversight of education as well as siphoning funds away from the residential colleges. Is GW planning on making this a model for the future? If so, what can we say to convince you that this is a terrible idea that may ruin the residential colleges in the long term if it continues?
  30. Do the financial exigency measures currently being implemented align with the university's academic mission and its goals for maintaining the quality of education, research, and student experience?
  31. What are the university's strategies for increasing diverse revenue streams to reduce reliance solely on cost-cutting measures?
- F. Compensation/Layoffs
1. Does the university anticipate laying off more faculty members if the financial crisis continues beyond AY 2025-2026? If this step will be taken, what is the tentative plan? Is GW going to give a one-year grace period like with GSEHD?

2. Have faculty and staff salaries overall have kept up with inflation in the last five years?
3. What is the size of total administration compensation costs for all personnel who are not directly student facing?
4. What is the head count and compensation of all executive staff and their direct reports in both central and colleges?
5. We have heard that there will be “voluntary” cuts to administrative salaries. Can we get a list of names and percentages?
6. For the administration voluntary pay cuts, did the university make recommendations to the deans? Vice Presidents? Are non-academic deans included or not included? Etc.... Were they progressive? What percentage were high income administrators asked to take and what did they actually take? Will cuts be in place for the entire FY26 year?
7. Are executive bonuses in FY 25 and FY 26 being distributed? If so, what is the budget impact in each year?
8. Do cuts to executive compensation include people who have left executive roles in the last year? (Were recently departed administrators also asked to take voluntary pay cuts to their negotiated parting gifts?)
9. The GW leadership team has substantially grown in the last three years, including a new senior vice president position, new vice provost positions, and a new associate provost position. At the same time salaries for these positions have grown. Each of these people presumably have staff. This is a lot of new spending. Should we expect administrative staffing spending to continue to grow? Or is there a long-term plan to contain costs at vice president and vice provost level?
10. Have our overhead (administrative) costs increased over time compared to faculty costs? If there has been a significant increase in the number of administrative personnel within academics, has there been a corresponding rise in faculty personnel relative to the number of students at GW?
11. There are concerns about what is happening with contracts & reappointment letters. Have processes changed or are they being delayed? What are the plans going forward? How will they promote transparency going forward and transparency about the process?
12. Are other measures that were used during COVID being considered - like reducing retirement contributions or increasing premiums for health insurance?
13. Is GW planning to offer buyouts for faculty in ways similar to Duke University as reported by the Chronicle of Higher Education?
14. Are there projections of 5-year revenue consequences of changes in policy and demographics? If so, what are they? Is this a bump in the road or a slide down a slope? Is there a 5-year plan to deal with the possibility that this is a slide down a slope? Not hiring anyone is NOT a plan.
15. How will decisions be made regarding “potential reductions in staff and certain faculty positions”?
16. What is the process for identifying “certain faculty positions” for reduction. Will faculty members be involved or consulted in this process? If so, how?
17. What support will the university offer to staff and faculty members whose positions are reduced or eliminated?
18. How long is the hiring freeze expected to remain in effect beyond October 1, 2025, if the financial situation does not significantly improve?

19. Beyond the voluntary temporary salary reduction for the leadership team, what other sacrifices are the leadership and the Board of Trustees making to address financial challenges?
20. How will the university ensure that the burden of these measures is distributed equitably across all levels of the institution, including administration, faculty, and staff?

G. School-level (mainly GSEHD) Questions

1. What are the most likely and least likely scenarios that the administration is considering based on current information?
2. While we acknowledge that many decisions will have to wait until the October Enrollment Census, it is evident that planning is currently underway among the administration. It would be beneficial to gain insights into the parameters of the actions they are considering, given the multitude of externalities and challenges that are currently present. *What actions are schools/units being asked to take immediately? What types of planning can faculty be engaged in/should they be engaged in in anticipation of the final numbers becoming available in mid-October?* [It is particularly pertinent for GSEHD, where certain decisions (such as whether to open Fall 2026 admissions) will inevitably need to be made prior to October.]
3. What support can/will the university provide to schools/units during this reorganization process? [In this context, I am not referring to financial support. However, I also consider thought leadership, support from other units and schools for impacted students whose programs may be affected by staff/faculty cuts, research funding reductions, support/orientation/mentorship for new and interim Deans as they are coming into a very difficult situation with a new and interim Provost, a “One GW” Communication strategy on how to engage potential students that might be wary of apply and accepting admission under these circumstances, etc.]
5. What (if any latitude) will individual schools/units be given to propose university-wide strategies for reimagining what GW looks like moving forward (such as mergers of schools/programs/departments), where should those talks begin—at the schools/units or within the Faculty Senate? Regardless of where they begin, is there a process by which such ideas should migrate from individual schools to larger communities?
6. How will the financial stability measures affect research funding and opportunities for faculty and students? Are there plans to seek alternative funding sources to support ongoing and future research projects?
7. How will the university ensure that diversity and inclusion initiatives are maintained and strengthened during this period of financial adjustment? Are there specific measures in place to support underrepresented groups within the faculty and student body?
8. Why is not the type of financial assistance given in previous years to GW Medicine now being offered to GSEHD? This seems to violate the “OneGW” approach we are being asked to adopt. Why isn’t some of the GW Endowment be used to help extend the school’s ability to reorganize itself without having to jettison 1/3 of its faculty?
9. When was the decision made to terminate the employment of one-third of the GSEHD faculty? President Granberg joined the GSEHD Faculty Meeting on May 1st, the letters were not mentioned during this session. What significant changes occurred between May 1st and June 23rd?
10. What metrics were used to determine which faculty were given early termination warning letters in the GSEHD context? Is this an indication of how the process might play out (if such terminations become necessary) in other schools?
11. What metrics were used to determine which faculty were given early termination warning letters in the GSEHD context? Is this an indication of how the process might play out (if

such terminations become necessary) in other schools? [At least in GSEHD it seems cuts are being made based on status (contract faculty) without the thought of what or how the school will service students moving forward that are already admitted OR as to what the school could look like post faculty reduction]

12. How will the university support non-tenure-track faculty whose contracts are not renewed, especially given the June 30 notification deadline mentioned in the article? Are there any resources or assistance programs available to them?
13. What measures will be put in place to ensure that the remaining GSEHD faculty members are not unduly burdened by the increased workload due to reduced staffing and class consolidation?
14. The so-called "Big Beautiful Bill" (or H.R.1) is projected to be particularly potentially hurtful to graduate education because of limiting government subsidies for graduate and professional loans. What strategies does the university think about engaging in to mitigate this impact? Should graduate units like GSEHD be looking to team up or merge with undergraduate units at this time in anticipation of tuition revenue reduction in AY 26-27? [Such plans will take a year to implement (at best) but the bill goes into effect in July 2026. But even in the "best" case scenario the policies put in place will be in place through AT LEAST AY 29-30]
15. How will the consolidation of classes and restructuring of the curriculum impact the academic quality, distinctiveness, and accreditation of GSEHD's programs, especially those that traditionally rely on smaller, specialized instruction?
16. What is the university's detailed strategy for reversing the persistent enrollment decline in the GSEHD? Are there specific marketing, recruitment, or program development initiatives planned for schools?
17. Beyond these "right-sizing" measures, what are the long-term plans to address the financial challenges specific to GSEHD?
18. How will the university ensure transparent communication and facilitate meaningful shared governance with GSEHD faculty throughout this "right-sizing" process, especially concerning decisions that directly impact their professional lives and the school's future?
19. What formal opportunities will be provided for GSEHD faculty to provide input and feedback on the proposed changes before final decisions are implemented?

## FSEC Prioritized Questions September 3, 2025

### Communication/Transparency:

- Would the administration be willing to create a plan for important communications (e.g., the July email to the university community on budget matters) to go through an FSEC or other relevant Senate consultation process (e.g., a Senate committee) while the message is being crafted to help ensure that the communication doesn't inadvertently include wording that would be of unnecessary concern to faculty?
- The Senate and FSEC need information ahead of meetings in order to be able to come to the table with thoughtful ideas; would the administration be willing to create a pre-read system (working with the Senate office on dissemination strategies) to facilitate this?
- The impressions of full consultation given in current administrative communications are frequently inaccurate and can be reputationally harmful to the groups referred to as having provided that consultation. Senate Resolution 25/2 (attached) provides background and strategies to address this concern.

### Compensation:

- Administrative staff costs: The GW leadership team has substantially grown in the last three years, including a new senior vice president position, new vice provost positions, and a new associate provost position. At the same time salaries for these positions have grown. Each of these people presumably have staff. This is a lot of new spending. Should we expect administrative staffing spending to continue to grow? Or is there a long-term plan to contain costs at the vice president and vice provost level?
- How have decisions been made to compensate administrators who have stepped down from their positions, and will those practices continue?
- What are the exceptions to the current hiring freeze? Other than the Provost search, what other searches are ongoing?

### Layoffs:

- What will the process be for engaging faculty in planning for potential faculty reductions, especially with respect to implications for organization and program restructuring and maintaining the academic integrity of our programs?
- How will all types of departing & remaining faculty be supported (e.g., access to health care for those departing, support for programmatic consolidations, student support, etc.)

### Budget/Enrollment:

- Specific enrollment issues (e.g., graduate, international) broken down by units would be very helpful—this should include not only current numbers but also trends over time; include costs and revenues.
- The impact of the OBBB (HR1) on budget planning and access to student funding
- Movement of programs from schools to central: Faculty are increasingly concerned that undergraduate programs are being moved to the central administration and away from the schools. The undergraduate tuition cap means that there are a finite number of credit hours available to generate revenue from undergraduate students. Increasingly, the central administration is moving some undergraduate tuition revenues to the Provost Office through the formation of new minors (e.g., sustainability). It is also moving research dollars away from the schools and toward the central administration through the formation of new

institutes (which thereby lose their connection to undergraduate education as they have no relationship to departments). This breaks the basic model of how undergraduate education works at GW, preventing department and school oversight of education as well as siphoning funds away from the residential colleges. Is GW planning on making this a model for the future? If so, what can we say to convince you that this is a terrible idea that may ruin the residential colleges in the long term if it continues?

- What percentage of overall cuts are happening in central admin as opposed to within the schools? Address central administration cost trendlines and their effects on school budgets.