



Faculty Senate

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SENATE MEETING
HELD ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2025
HYBRID: 805 21st STREET NW/MPA 309 & ZOOM**

Present: President Granberg; Interim Provost Lach; Executive Committee Chair Schultheiss; Parliamentarian Binder; Registrar Cloud; Senate Office Staff Liz Carlson and Jenna Chaojareon; Deans Ayres, Goldman, Henry, Matthew, Riddle, Wahlbeck, and Yeltekin; Interim Dean Zara; Professors Akman, Badie, Belenky, Briggs, Brinkerhoff, Callier, Cohen-Cole, Core, Cottrol, Crandall, Cseh, Eakle, El-Ghazawi, Engel, Fagan, Feldman, Gore, Hernandez, Kay, Kieff, Kulp, Markus, McAlister, Mendelowitz, Mylonas, Orti, Rain, Rigg, Sarkar, Schwindt, Trangsrud, Vyas, Warren, White, Wilson, and Wirtz.

Absent: Deans Bass and Kelly-Weeder; Interim Dean Howard; Professors Bamford, Borum, Cheh, and Merluzzi.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:05p.m.

MINUTES APPROVALS

The minutes of the following meetings were approved without objection:

- May 9, 2025 (regular meeting)
- August 12, 2025 (special meeting/open session)
- August 12, 2025 (special meeting/executive session)

RESOLUTION 26/1: OF APPRECIATION FOR CHRISTOPHER ALAN BRACEY (Katrin Schultheiss, Faculty Senate Executive Committee)

Professor Schultheiss stated that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) is withdrawing Resolution 26/1 at this time. Robert's Rules allows the mover of a resolution to take it off the agenda, before it advances to consideration, without a vote. Going forward, she confirmed that resolutions for the Senate agenda must be either 1) reported from a committee, 2) come via petition of 8 senators, or 3) be a matter requested by the President.

INTRODUCTIONS (Ellen Granberg, President, & John Lach, Interim Provost)

President Granberg formally introduced John Lach, who is serving as Interim Provost, Chief Academic Officer, and Executive Vice President. Dr. Lach started in this role on July 1, and she expressed her gratitude to him for taking on these important responsibilities during this time of transition.

She next welcomed GW's new Vice President for University Advancement David Unruh, who started in August. Mr. Unruh joined GW from Drexel University, where he served as Senior Vice President for Institutional Advancement. Her team is very pleased he is at the university, especially as GW's next comprehensive fundraising campaign nears. Mr. Unruh is not able to attend today's meeting but would like to attend a future Senate meeting to talk about what he has learned about GW advancement and what he sees as the university's next and most important opportunities.

President Granberg noted that today is Milken Institute School of Public Health (GWSPH) Dean Lynn Goldman's final Senate meeting and thanked her for all of her service and leadership. Dean Goldman expressed her appreciation for the dedication of all those who serve on the Faculty Senate. This service requires a great deal of time and is very important to the university. She stated that she appreciates how much her time with the Senate has contributed to her education and development during her term as Dean.

The President next introduced GW Chief of Police Victor Brito, who brings experience as part of D.C.'s Metropolitan Police Department as well as experience at a number of municipal police departments. Chief Brito expressed how honored he is to be GW's Chief of Police and to have the opportunity to make the campus as safe and resilient as possible.

Interim Provost Lach introduced GW School of Business (GWSB) Dean Sevin Yeltekin, who joined GW on August 1st from the University of Rochester, where she served as dean of the Simon Business School and Frontier Professor of Business Administration. Just last week, GW Today published a profile about Dean Yeltekin; Dr. Lach encouraged everyone to read that informative piece. Dean Yeltekin thanked the GW community for their warm welcome.

Next, Dr. Lach introduced Graduate School of Education & Human Development (GSEHD) Interim Dean Lionel Howard, who began his role on July 1st. He has been a member of the GSEHD faculty since 2009 and most recently served as academic dean and a professor of educational research. Due to travel, Dr. Howard was unable to join today's meeting.

Also beginning an Interim Dean term on July 1st is Jason Zara, serving in the School of Engineering & Applied Sciences (SEAS). He joined GW as a faculty member in 2002 and has served as a member of the Faculty Senate and as an associate dean for academic affairs in GW Engineering. Dean Zara echoed Dean Goldman's appreciation for the work of the Senate and added that he is very happy to advance the work in SEAS begun by Dr. Lach.

Finally, Dr. Lach introduced Emily Hammond, the Glen Earl Weston Research Professor of Law, who was named interim vice provost for faculty affairs, effective September 1st. They previously held this role from 2022-2023. Most recently, they served as the inaugural faculty director of academic sustainability programs for the GW Alliance for a Sustainable Future. Professor Hammond stated that it is a joy to be back in this role and to have already begun working closely with the faculty.

PRESIDENT'S & PROVOST'S REPORTS (Ellen Granberg, President, & John Lach, Interim Provost)

The [President's report](#) and [Interim Provost's report](#) are attached.

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/PRESIDENT'S & PROVOST'S REPORTS

Professor Wilson noted that the weekly federal update is very useful. With regard to the letter from the Department of Justice (DOJ), he was struck by what the DOJ referred to as “findings” alongside the fact that they did not talk to GW leadership before issuing the letter. He asked whether it is misleading to refer to these as “findings” rather than “assertions.” President Granberg responded that she was surprised and personally disappointed that GW wasn’t contacted and asked to provide documentation. With that said, the letter is a legal finding from the DOJ, and GW has to respond to it. The university’s attorneys have responded to the DOJ and have asked for an opportunity to meet in order to hear about their perspective and present the university’s perspective.

Professor Wirtz noted that he did not hear any reference to the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA) and asked where this matter stands. He also extended his thanks to Dean Goldman for all she has done for the university. One part of her legacy, he observed, is her work on the leadership team that got the university through the COVID period. He stated that his own reading of the present public health moment is that there is at least a reasonable possibility that the country could be moving in a similar direction before long, and he asked what mechanisms are in place if GW finds itself confronted with the same situation Dean Goldman and others so effectively responded to when COVID hit.

President Granberg first referenced the short mention in her report indicating that she expected to provide the next substantive update on the MFA at the October Senate meeting.

Observing that Professor Wirtz’s second question arises from what is happening around vaccinations nationally, the President confirmed that the university is in a much better position to address situation like that, given the work that was done in 2020-2021. Professor Wirtz asked whether the university is in a position to respond quickly in a situation like COVID, particularly given the difficulties experienced around obtaining supplies in 2020. President Granberg responded that she does not know the details of GW’s stockpiles but can say generally that the university has incredible expertise in GWSPH and the School of Medicine & Health Sciences (SMHS) and will have incredibly good guidance. She added that the incoming GWSPH dean is an expert in infectious disease, as are many others in GW’s medical sector.

Dean Goldman added that GW saved the equipment it obtained during COVID. Some is now in use for students and other purposes but can be redeployed if needed to address public health needs on campus. She noted that the university’s health & safety organization—amazing from day one of the pandemic—has gone through dramatic upgrades since COVID. Professor Wirtz noted that the response to his question as to whether GW will be in a position to respond in an immediate fashion if needed is clearly yes.

Professor Cohen-Cole asked what principles FSEC used to make recommendations for membership on the Working Group on Budget Matters. Referencing the 6% decline in master’s enrollments, he asked how, if this decline is not represented in an equal basis across schools, it is being reflected in school budgets. He speculated a few possibilities: the budget model could remain as it was, the model could change to reflect unequal impacts across schools, or ad hoc changes could be made to the margins. He noted that he has no knowledge about how these declines are distributed but that it seems unlikely that this decline would be exactly equal across the schools.

In response to Professor Cohen-Cole’s first question, Professor Schultheiss noted that FSEC was invited to offer nominations for the Working Group on Budget Matters and four others. They were invited to do so in

the same manner as anyone else, including the relevant Senate standing committees, via a web form. There was no special privilege in any nominations coming from FSEC members.

Dr. Lach responded to Professor Cohen-Cole's second question, noting that the impacts of the decline in master's enrollments are indeed not equally distributed across schools. (He added that one of the biggest impacts in this area comes from visa interviews being halted.) Over the past six months, the university has been working to adjust its projections, which led to the July budgets. There are still numerous dynamics at play, and he is working with each individual school on the impacts of these enrollment decreases. He stated that extra work will be required for schools with higher than expected enrollment decreases to ensure they can meet their margin targets; the budget iterations undertaken over the past few months have been good work in this direction. He added that a major goal in the development of the new budget model is not to have fiscal year-to-fiscal year adjustments in response to changing circumstances but instead to reach a multi-year planning mode.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (Katrin Schultheiss, Chair)

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

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

President Granberg thanked FSEC for their work in prioritizing the submitted questions. She noted that she would bring draft responses to the October 3 FSEC meeting and then begin bringing full responses to the October 24 Senate meeting.

RESOLUTION 26/2: ON PRIORITIZING EDUCATION AT GW (Jamie Cohen-Cole, Co-Chair, Educational Policy & Technology Committee)

Professor Cohen-Cole began by thanking Dr. Lach for his comments about the Gallup expenses and contract. The background for the present resolution precedes both President Granberg's term and Dr. Lach's Interim Provost role. During the LeBlanc presidency, significant concerns were raised about the Disney Institute initiative on campus, which was, he stated, a great deal for Disney. They got out a generic survey they had already designed for an airline. At the same time, university leadership signed off on a deal in which the university got the short end of the stick. The survey was expensive, it was built for an airline but not a university, and—because GW has experts in this area who reviewed the instruction—it was poorly constructed. The survey was bad enough that faculty who teach introduction to survey methods were able to quickly note to their students how the Disney survey violated basic principles, such as no double-barreled questions.

Professor Cohen-Cole next turned to COVID and the related financial crisis. According to the then-CFO, the university could face more than \$100 million in losses due to COVID. This expected loss led to downsizing student services, such as academic consulting, and to centralizing both research and IT; these actions impacted GW's students and hurt research. At the same time, he noted, the CFO was spending millions by forgiving MFA debt, looking to tie GW to the MFA and the hospital for decades, and creating new vice-presidential positions and staffing roles to support those new vice presidents. GW also engaged in expensive consulting contracts, including one for the master plan. This contract not only cost a great deal to operate but operated as though GW could spend hundreds of millions of dollars in new buildings for STEM labs while also planning to reduce classrooms and dorms. This planning failed to consider whether the university would be hiring 200 new faculty who would use the new buildings, much less where students

would be housed and taught. In short, Professor Cohen-Cole noted, this was an expensive consulting project that, if implemented, would have destroyed the university. This occurred because leadership was disconnected from and not transparent with faculty, who best know the operations of GW's most basic foundational functions: education the student experience.

In this context, the faculty recommended focusing on core functions and reminded leadership that education and research are the university's core mission. Faculty also repeatedly asked that the leadership be honest about the budget and prioritize the needs of GW's students, focus on the university's core mission, and to save money in a variety of ways including relying on local experts before engaging in expensive consulting projects. These requests included a [June 2020 public letter from FSEC to the Board of Trustees](#), which is attached to the minutes of this meeting for reference. Faculty in the Senate and beyond asked many times about the need for the Disney contract as well as for information about Gallup. They asked to know how much was spent, if the contracts could be cancelled, and for access to the data that was produced. President LeBlanc either didn't answer or gave misleading answers about these matters.

Professor Cohen-Cole noted that he is provided this background because, even when faculty were being told one thing in 2020 about Disney and Gallup, university leadership proceeded to engage Gallup and start paying them in 2020. As Dr. Lach shared today, those contract payments concluded in 2024. In looking at the current situation, the university budget is under pressure. Some of this pressure manifests through freezing merit raises—which, in an inflationary environment, is a pay cut. Some of this pressure is reflected in freezes in faculty and staff hiring, which impacts the research faculty can do and makes it harder for students to find the classes they need. It also appears in struggles to make services available that everyone at the university needs, including full access to Gelman and Eckles and a reliably running Vern Express. There are very long lines for the VEX as well unreliable performance of basic functions like campus WiFi, and maintenance to buildings is long-delayed. Less mission critical but impacting student experience nonetheless is the fact that the ice cream machine in the Pelham dining hall is nonfunctional. More important, he noted, the university has also frozen consideration of new student groups.

Noting that the Gallup contract is now fully paid and is water under the bridge, he stated that Resolution 26/2 is future-focused and asks for very basic things—transparency and consultation—and not a return to past actions. The resolution recommends that the university rely on local experts, namely, the faculty and Office of Institutional Research, and that it prioritize GW's core mission by reducing spending on external consultants.

Professor Cohen-Cole moved adoption of the resolution, and President Granberg opened the floor to general questions or comments about the resolution.

Professor Akman asked what method of accountability the committee considered around its recommendation to engage GW faculty as consultants on surveys to be conducted at GW. Professor Cohen-Cole responded that the Educational Policy & Technology committee (EPT) considered faculty involvement at the level of survey design, with surveys then being run by GW's Institutional Research office. The committee did not envision that faculty would have a role in the immediate operation if rolling out the survey.

Professor Wilson mentioned an anecdote from a conversation with a GW School of Business (GWSB) colleague (who does some external consulting) who confirmed his assertion that consultants are experts at telling people who are paying for their services what they want to hear. He observed that a qualified faculty

member dedicated to the university will do a better job than a paid consultant who is contracted for a paycheck.

Regarding the Gallup survey, Professor Akman asked if there was a reason that the leadership did not want to and did not share the cost of this contract. President Granberg and CFO Fernandes responded that, typically, the terms of individual vendor contracts are not made public.

Professor Warren asked if faculty participating in survey creation would be compensated financially, given service credit, or “voluntold.” Professor Cohen-Cole responded that EPT imagined that this work would be done as a service opportunity. He added that EPT imagined that this work would not be an enormous lift given the involvement of the Office of Institutional Research.

Professor Brinkerhoff asked whether EPT considered other ways of engaging faculty (e.g., oversight or participation on steering committee) as opposed to direct creation of surveys—essentially a spectrum of involvement as opposed to automatically assuming faculty would be responsible for the full writing of surveys. Professor Cohen-Cole responded that the committee’s thought was that the identified expertise of faculty and the established expertise of Institutional Research (which is currently understaffed) would advise on how best to proceed. There was no consideration that faculty should roll out and monitor the operation of a survey itself. (He added that most of the trouble Institutional Research has in terms of surveys is in the sheer number of surveys being requested and conducted at GW.) One benefit of in-house surveys—either developed by faculty, Institutional Research, or a collaboration—is that the resulting data would be more easily accessible through the Institutional Research office; external surveys such as those conducted by Disney do not allow data to be made available in a substantial or transparent way. In addition, in-house surveys could encourage more participation when respondents feel their time is well used on creating data that will be fully available to the university.

Professor Orti noted that the faculty did engage in survey creation during the LeBlanc presidency. The survey was developed and conducted by faculty. Institutional Research support was requested and denied, and so faculty built and conducted the survey and reported the results on its own. This could be a precedent for future work, especially if Institutional Research can be involved.

Professor Wirtz noted a sense of déjà vu around Gallup and, previously, Disney. He noted that the Senate seems to hear about these initiatives after decisions have been made to engage in contracts. Now that GW is reaching the end of the current Gallup contract, he asked whether leadership anticipates extending the Gallup contract or anything that would be an offshoot of the current contract once it expires. More broadly, he asked what mechanism the leadership anticipates would be implemented so that the Senate and the GW community writ large is involved in deliberations in advance of arrangements being made with a Disney or Gallup-like entity. President Granberg responded that there have been no conversations about extending the Gallup contract. She noted that it can be very appropriate to engage the community in the election of a survey instrument; she referenced the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey, which focuses on the faculty experience. She stated her belief that a smaller group is necessary for instrument selection but that having the community’s voices involved in looking at the different options and making choices makes a lot of sense.

Noting that she is not asking for changes to the current resolution, the President offered two comments about asking faculty to write and deliver surveys: 1) broader surveys (e.g., Gallup) allow for nationally normed data. COACHE has an amazing resource of comparative data that allows faculty to understand where they land relative to their peers nationally, and these products are the only way nationally normed data

can be obtained; and 2) faculty can be extremely helpful in an oversight role where they can see all the data and advise the university on how to work with it.

Professor Cseh observed that the question here is one of expenses on this work (in addition to in-house consultation), particularly when budgets are stressed. It would be nice, she stated, to have discussions with organizations like Gallup before locking in contracts. GW has psychometricians who are paid by companies like Gallup and have relevant expertise that can be brought to this work. As an expert on organization development and change, she also stated her hope that the university never arrives more broadly at the situation the Graduate School of Education & Human Development (GSEHD) experienced in June. GSEHD faculty were taken by surprise at end of June when about 25% of their faculty received termination letters—both contract and tenure-track—with no prior notice. She extended a plea to the leadership to use organizational development and change expertise at GW before implementing these kinds of changes.

Professor Cohen-Cole noted that EPT definitely recommended considering national norms, with some committee members feeling that there are better organizations than Gallup for this purpose.

No amendments were proposed to either the Resolving or the Whereas clauses, and [Resolution 26/2](#) was adopted by unanimous consent.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

None.

GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Nominations for Senate Standing Committee Membership
The attached [nominations for standing committee membership](#) were approved as a whole by unanimous consent.

Professor Kulp nominated Professor Roger Trangsrud to the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting committee as a voting member; the nomination was approved by unanimous consent.

- II. Senate Standing Committee Reports
No standing committee reports were received prior to today's meeting.

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Professor Schultheiss announced that the Joint Committee for Faculty & Students (JCFS), which works on issues concerning faculty & students, is being reconstituted after a couple of years of dormancy. The committee is looking for a Faculty Senate member who would be willing to serve on this committee, and she asked that anyone interested please reach out to Jenna Chaojareon.

Professor Wirtz expressed shock that this committee has not been in continuing operation and asked what happened to lead to that. Mr. Mory noted that JCFS existed at GW for decades and was created in response to a request from prior president. The committee created a space where faculty and students can engage deeply on issues of importance. Changes in student government and the pandemic led to JCFS falling dormant. The current student government has advocated to restore the committee, and Mr. Mory stated

that he and Dean Coleman are actively working to make that happen. He added that he served on this committee as a GW student and found it to be an excellent forum. Ms. Carlson noted that the committee includes a student chair and a faculty chair and that the Faculty Senate representative is not the faculty chair; that person has already been identified. Professor Wirtz expressed his strong view that it is a great idea to get this committee working again.

Professor Orti referenced the flooding in the Science & Engineering Hall (SEH) this past weekend. He acknowledged the great response of the facilities team, which originated in the Biology-department managed greenhouse. He also noted that this event could have been avoided; the Biology department has been raising concerns about the floor grading and the drain positioning in the greenhouse since it was built in 2015. Those issues were partially but never completely addressed, and Professor Orti noted that high staff turnover and the loss of institutional memory works against finding solutions to issues like this. He added that there is now a plan in place to prevent this from happening again, but it comes only after the fact. President Granberg thanked Professor Orti for his well-stated remarks.

Professor Eakle observed that there is a lot of pain in GSEHD right now. He appreciated that President Granberg plans to respond in full to the prioritized questions relayed by FSEC but asked if she might share a bit about one particular question as GSEHD is in the process of major changes on a short timetable. Specifically: How will all types of departing and remaining faculty be supported in the circumstances of layoffs? President Granberg began her response by emphasizing that the Faculty Code will be followed in this and all cases. In terms of support for individuals being laid off, she noted that everyone will receive all required notice. They will also receive a set of resources through HR, but these are less useful to faculty than to staff. She affirmed that it has been a very painful period not only for people who received termination letters but for their remaining colleagues. She asked that GSEHD faculty be in touch with Interim Dean Howard about what would be helpful to them at this time.

Dr. Lach added that he has had several meetings with Interim Dean Howard and attended a GSEHD faculty town hall a few weeks ago, which was a challenging but productive discussion. GW's goal is to build a strong GSEHD going forward; this means supporting faculty and students who remain part of the school. He noted that enrollment challenges have made it hard to support the school the way the university would like to.

Professor Eakle noted that there is a lack of clarity around whether supplemental instructional payments are being eliminated to all schools. Dr. Lach responded that this is not happening right now. The new budget model will include an effort to remove "strange and quiet" financial arrangements that do not have a lot of transparency, but this is not a driver of what is happening in GSEHD, where declining enrollments and the net revenue to the school have resulted in a declining margin. The work now is centered on how to bring the margin up to where GSEHD can thrive.

Professor El-Ghazawi noted that the SEH flood could have been far worse, as there is very sensitive equipment in the building that could have been damaged or destroyed. He stated that, upon learning about the flooding Saturday morning from off campus, he called UPD and had difficulty convincing the person answering the non-emergency line to send someone to help; he ultimately called the line for life-threatening emergencies to try and have someone dispatched. SEH faculty were very concerned and frustrated, and the emergency response was difficult to get started. Baxter Goodly, Vice President for Safety & Operations, responded that he would take this issue back to look at the processes. He noted that the first message came in at 9:46am on Saturday and that Facilities personnel were on site quickly after that, making the determination to shut off the electricity in certain areas.

Professor Akman recognized a remarkable member of the SMHS community: Emeritus Professor Seymour Perlin, who turns 100 this month. Dr. Perlin, an expert in suicidology, remains an active member of the SMHS community, attending weekly grand rounds. Dr. Perlin served on the faculty from 1997 to 1998; in 2023, Dr. Perlin's son Jonathan honored his parents with an endowed professorship in psychiatry and behavioral sciences; the family has four generations represented at GW. Dr. Akman noted that SMHS is putting on a centennial celebration for Dr. Perlin, consisting of several lectures, over the course of the coming year.

Professor Brinkerhoff, reluctant to return to less happy matters, noted that it is heartbreaking to watch what has unfolded in GSEHD and that it would be callous not to imagine what it would feel like to be in that position. She asked how the university continues to support its students and programming in these circumstances, and, given the deep concerns around this issue, if the President might comment on what she thought a more constructive process would look like should there be a need for additional layoffs. Under these very uncertain circumstances, it would be prudent to have systems in place before they need to be exercised.

President Granberg responded that, in an ideal state, this is an ongoing conversation, where there is cognizance of enrollment reaching a point that needs to be addressed and where deans have time to work with faculty before decisions have to be made. The situation in GSEHD proceeded so quickly that there was a sense that the first set of letters had to go out very quickly; there was a long period of decline and then a very sharp drop that necessitated quick action. She agreed that the university needs a better plan to catch these situations, especially because budgets are tight and the master's market very challenged. She observed that one thing she particularly likes in the Faculty Code is the provision that faculty must be given the opportunity to generate options for the school's future; this is part of Interim Dean Howard's charge. She strongly reiterated Professor Eakle's earlier statements, acknowledging that it has been hard to be a GSEHD faculty member for many years. The hope is that the current actions and work will allow the school to emerge stronger. Dr. Lach added that this is a prime example of why multi-year budget planning is so important; under that model, one bad year does not upend everything.

Professor Wilson stated that the GSHED situation was a failure of communication, with faculty blindsided by the terminations that took place. If the issue is the budget, he noted, the budget should be readily available; he asked how many of the specifics the faculty were made aware of during this process. Dr. Lach responded that the GSEHD town hall he held with faculty included information about margin trends and that he and the dean are discussing these matters as well. Professor Wilson noted that the circle of information should be wider than just the deans and should include more detail than overall margin trends.

Professor Eakle appreciated the idea of multi-year planning and assured those present that GSEHD has hit the ground running and is already planning a number of paths forward. He noted that one recent question asked of the interim academic dean was about tenured faculty. The conditions by which tenure is awarded and continued under the Faculty Code are clear. In the spirit of moving to multi-year planning and on retaining quality faculty, he asked what the President's position is on tenure. President Granberg responded that she is 100% in support of tenure, noting that she herself was a tenured faculty member. She observed that tenure is a very important part of how universities operate and is linked now more than ever to academic freedom. She stated she has no intention of backing away from tenure at all. She acknowledged that there are some provisions in the Faculty Code around extreme financial exigency but affirmed that the leadership is not discussing that option. Dr. Lach added that his conversations with the Board of Trustees

Finance committee confirms this position and that he has been very pleased by the Board's understanding of the importance of tenure.

Professor Cseh noted that today's discussion around GSEHD is not only about GSEHD; it is about systems, transparency, how the university community works together, and leadership. She stated that the situation in GSEHD could happen at any school at any time with the same systems in place. She appreciated the thought processes around how to move forward and not allow this to happen again. Institutional memory is an issue, she observed, but everyone involved knows that the system was broken. She expressed her thanks to President Granberg's commitment that this won't happen again, noting that, in her conversations with colleagues at other universities, this situation seems unprecedented.

Professor Cohen-Cole, observing that many GSEHD faculty are saying there was information about the school's situation that was not known, asked whether transparency in this situation was at the level it should have been or could be improved. He asked whether the Board is prepared to engage in multi-year budgeting, given that the communication each year is that the Board has set a budget at a certain level that cannot be adjusted. President Granberg responded that the Board is indeed in favor of multi-year planning; they have heard very clearly from CFO Fernandes, Dr. Lach, and herself how problematic the current model is. The problem, she noted, is that GW does not have the infrastructure it needs to make good on the promise of multi-year budgeting yet. This is a big part of what the new budget model is meant to help accomplish; those mechanisms need to be in place in order to smooth the bumps that happen at the school and university levels.

President Granberg shared an anecdote from a recent exchange at one of her faculty coffee events, which often include very frank conversations. In one exchange that bothered her a great deal, a faculty member relayed that a piece of equipment key to their research failed, and they were not able to get approval to replace it. She stated that the situation was worked out following this conversation, but this should not be what it takes to resolve these issues. In the spirit of getting everyone ready for conversations about the structural budget issues, she added that one reason things are so tight is that GW's margin is razor thin. A larger margin provides more flexibility and access to funding; getting back to a 2-4% annual margin will provide the budget flexibility the university needs to address issues like the one she described. Hard work will be required to get to this point, but she was confident that the results would be excellent. Dr. Lach added that, while the work on new budget model does not magically create more money, the new model will create a foundation for greater margins and multi-level transparency.

Professor Eakle asked how the capital campaign is progressing. President Granberg responded that it is in its "quiet phase" and that Mr. Unruh will come to the Senate to talk about this. The good news, she noted, is that there are many people who want to help GW.

Professor Crandall noted that, in the current budget climate, the message of 3% cuts across the board suggests that the data isn't being thoroughly interrogated as some programs are growing and others shrinking, some are more expensive to operate and some less expensive, etc. He observed that there was a "cost per student per major" calculation at his prior university but that he has not seen a similar calculation at GW. He noted that he is in a sizable research area, and all of the academic work falls on five faculty in his department. The program was born on a shoestring budget five years ago, then COVID happened, and the budget has been cut ever since. He reported having two staff members to help the department support the largest PhD program in the school (if not the university); programs like this can only sustain cuts for so long.

President Granberg confirmed that the cost-per-major data Professor Crandall referenced does not exist at GW; she was very surprised to learn this as she was accustomed to having access to that kind of data. She stated that the new budget model will allow the university to start to generate those kinds of metrics. She added that there is a question about how much transparency is appropriate, as this can create a culture of haves and have-nots; she wanted to hear from faculty before making decisions on how much transparency GW should strive to achieve. She stated that the 3% reduction was at the university level; the vice presidents and deans were authorized to meter what any given unit might be asked to cut, and that did happen.

Professor Wilson was pleased to hear that the university has many potential donors but asked about a recent Hatchet report that current-year donations are down sharply. Mr. Mory responded that the Hatchet report referred to a cash-only report, not a commitment report and that Mr. Unruh would be able to speak to this when he visits the Senate later this term. President Granberg responded that university leadership, including herself, needs to cultivate the support of those who want to help; the deans will also be key to these efforts.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20pm.

**Faculty Senate
President's Report
September 12, 2025**

Hello, and good afternoon, everyone.

As I begin my report, I want to acknowledge the assassination of Charlie Kirk at Utah Valley University on Wednesday. This continues a terrible trend of increasing political violence that has killed or severely injured individuals from across the political spectrum. As the university with the most politically engaged student body in the country, there are a lot of GW students who were badly shaken by this most recent attack. In fact, Wednesday afternoon, I had the opportunity to meet with the head of the College Republicans who shared with me how worried and scared this assault on our democracy left them. What gives me hope is that the College Republicans, the College Democrats, and Young Americans for Freedom all came together to support each other Wednesday night, and they are collaborating on a unity circle that will take place Monday night. I hope you will all join me in keeping them on our minds and in our hearts as they process this senseless tragedy.

Fall 2025 Semester Start

Now let me turn to my planned report. I want to open my report with some good news, the best of which is that we've had a wonderful start to the fall semester. The week before classes we held the New Faculty/Leader Orientation. We welcomed 48 new faculty members across the university as well as 80 new academic leaders (e.g., assistant/associate deans, directors, chairs)

Move-In, Convocation, and Welcome Day of Service were all successes. This year, we moved 6,632 students into residence halls. More than 500 staff members from 13 campus offices volunteered to help! And on Welcome Day of Service, 2,200 GW students contributed 8,800 service hours at 62 different sites across the DMV. I had the opportunity to visit a local school and very much enjoyed spending the day there.

Next week, I will be hosting a reception to celebrate and congratulate our newly tenured GW faculty members.

FY26 Budget

The GW board of trustees has formally approved GW's FY26 budget. I want to give a special word of thanks to Bruno Fernandes, Hemant Bakshi, Michael Glatzer, and the entire team for some very hard work. The process hasn't been perfect, and it hasn't been easy, but we are making important progress to address both the FY26 budget gap and the structural deficit.

As you know, in order to help us generate ideas on managing the FY26 Budget, I will be appointing a **Working Group on Budget Matters**. This group of faculty and staff from across the university will be advising senior leadership on decisions regarding additional measures we could take in relation to closing the FY26 budget. I want to thank FSEC for sharing recommendations on membership. We are in the process of finalizing the working group and will be convening them soon. Of course, Bruno will continue to consult with the Faculty Senate Finance and Budgeting Committee.

Negotiations with UHS are progressing in earnest, and I expect to be able to give another substantive update on the Medical Faculty Associates in October.

Enrollment Update

As we finish the third week of classes, the Fall enrollment currently shows more than 24,500 total students from all 50 US states, DC, and 144 countries and US territories are registered for classes. We are continuing to assist students in registering in a variety of programs over the coming weeks. Both undergraduate and professional full-time enrollment levels are similar to last fall and on pace with our planning estimates.

We met our new undergraduate class enrollment goal and welcomed more than 2,700 new first-year and transfer students to campus in August. It is an impressive new class with a strong academic profile, extensive leadership experiences, and a clear commitment to building stronger communities. They've had a great start and are already becoming engaged in all aspects of campus and DC life.

As expected, we are seeing declines in our graduate enrollments. We have about 460 fewer international graduate and professional students and fewer part-time master's students. These changes represent about a 6% decline in our graduate student enrollments and are likely linked to this summer's delay in issuing international student visas and the recent workforce changes in the D.C. area. These drops were expected and were already factored into the FY26 budget.

Final enrollment will be confirmed after the October census, and we expect most financial aid appeals to be resolved by mid-November, giving us a clearer picture of tuition and fees revenues by early December. Given the external conditions we are facing, I am pleased that the core populations of our enrollment have remained stable, and our student body continues to represent the academic excellence that GW is known for.

Federal Updates

As you know, we received a notice of findings from the Department of Justice (DOJ) on August 11. The DOJ reached a conclusion regarding allegations of antisemitism on our campus; their findings primarily focused on the Spring 2024 encampment on University Yard. This letter was the first communication we received from the DOJ since its initial February 2025 letter; we were not asked to answer any specific questions or provide any information in relation to this investigation. We have responded to the DOJ that we are willing to meet with them to discuss their conclusion and potential next steps; we are now waiting to hear back from them. I will keep this group updated on any progress.

Faculty input is critical as we chart our pathway forward, and I know opportunities for faculty input are of great interest to the Senate. To assist with gathering that input, there will be multiple tracks for faculty engagement. The first is a faculty **Working Group on Federal Matters** to review and provide feedback on recent resolution agreements signed by Brown and Columbia as well as any others that might be made public. This work is highly sensitive and consequently will be done under privilege, which is a new level of involvement for faculty at GW; it allows for tapping those with particular expertise.

Nominations have been submitted from FSEC and the chairs of the Faculty Senate committees on Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies and Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, as well as from vice presidents and deans. I want to emphasize at the outset that this committee is being convened to engage in genuine consultation. Its purpose is not to ratify a predetermined outcome but rather to bring a range of perspectives to bear on high stakes federal matters. The goal will be for committee members to review the resolution agreements, weigh them thoughtfully, and produce recommendations that reflect the breadth of this group's deliberation—not just any single person's preferences. The committee's feedback will be shared with our outside counsel and both the senior administration and the Board of Trustees.

In addition to this working group, the administration will hold a workshop for the Faculty Senate committees to engage with publicly available documents and offer their views on these same topics. Lastly, Board of Trustees Chair Grace Speights has agreed to hold a special meeting with FSEC, university leadership, and the Board of Trustees to provide a similar opportunity for FSEC members to offer their views on these matters directly to the Board.

Regarding campus safety and increased federal law enforcement in the District, we are in regular touch with the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) and others to understand the potential impact of the increase in federal law enforcement in the District of Columbia and presence of the National Guard in the city. The university has met with MPD and other D.C. universities to discuss how MPD will be engaging with federal law enforcement groups, including the National Guard. MPD remains the primary contact for university campuses, and, at this time, MPD is aware of no plans for federal agents or National Guard to patrol university campuses.

Having said that, GW is a place where public streets run through every part of the Foggy Bottom campus, so I know we are all aware of the possibility that federal forces could be deployed to the GW campus in certain scenarios. At this point, we expect federal officials will continue to coordinate efforts through MPD prior to any actions on our or any other DC campus. Considering the fluidity of the situation, GWPD and the rest of the emergency operations and campus safety team are constantly monitoring the situation and consulting with MPD and are ready to respond should any issues occur.

I encourage all of you to read the university's weekly federal update, which includes information about matters related to the federalization of the DC police. We launched this update in March, and honestly, I thought it might last a month, maybe two, but here we are six months later, and the update continues!

Strategic Framework Implementation

As you know, the entire community has put a lot of work into developing our strategic framework, and we are looking forward to publicly launching it in October. I want to take a moment to thank the framework's steering committee for their continued work and the hundreds of community members who have helped us get to this exciting moment. As we look to make progress on the framework, we evaluated all the feedback we received; we will begin with the three big ideas that got the most support from the community. Using this feedback, we're going to stake working groups to build out recommendations for three areas: enhancing GW's interdisciplinary research ecosystem, better leveraging DC experiences as a part of our student journey, and improving academic and career advising.

The **Interdisciplinary Research Ecosystem Working Group**, co-chaired by Dean Dayna Matthew and Interim Vice Provost Bob Miller, will explore the characteristics and components of a thriving interdisciplinary research ecosystem and how to promote and expand those characteristics and components across GW.

The **DC Experiences Working Group**, co-chaired by Vice Provost and Dean Colette Coleman and Dean Alyssa Ayers, will examine how to embed Washington-based opportunities across the journey of every GW student.

The **Academic and Career Advising Working Group** will be co-chaired by Vice Provost Jay Goff and Dean Paul Wahlbeck, will look at expanding and enhancing academic and career advising to give students a seamless support system and expand opportunities that prepare them for what's next.

I want to once again thank FSEC and the deans and vice presidents for making recommendations for these working groups. As they move forward, there will be a number of opportunities for campus stakeholders to inform their proceedings.

We are also preparing to launch two additional initiatives in conjunction with phase 1: a community process to review and update GW's mission statement, and what has become fondly known as the "Sand in the Gears" initiative, which is the effort to designed to simplify and improve administrative barriers our community encounters across the university. I will have more to say about these initiatives soon.

Provost Search

The search for GW's next provost is underway. I want to thank Katrin—once again—for serving as co-chair of the search advisory committee. Her leadership gives FSEC a direct connection to the search. I'd also like to thank Faculty Senator Susan Kulp for serving on the search advisory committee. I know that service on this committee will demand time and energy, so I am especially grateful to Susan for her service and Katrin for her leadership.

Nominations of candidates are welcome. You can send them directly to me, to Katrin, or to the search firm. We will accept applications through the end of this semester with interviews to start early next year. This position is critical to the future of the university, and your engagement in the search process will help shape the future of the university. I want to thank you in advance for your participation.

Throughout this report, I have shared information about five different working groups focused on the budget, federal matters, and strategic framework initiatives, as well as Faculty Senate involvement in the upcoming search for our next provost. Each of these represents an important opportunity for faculty voices to contribute to university decision making. Your engagement will ensure that we have input reflecting the breadth of our community's expertise and will make a lasting difference in the future of the university. I want to thank you in advance for your contributions as we move forward, and I am looking forward to our continued partnership throughout this next academic year.

Thank you, everyone. That concludes my report today.



**Faculty Senate
Interim Provost Lach Report
September 12, 2025**

Good afternoon, everyone!

I'm honored to give my first Provost Report to the Faculty Senate as interim provost and executive vice president for academic affairs.

It has certainly been a whirlwind couple of months since I started in this role on July 1st, truly an experience unlike any other, even as someone who has spent 25 years in higher education. I spent the first 19 years of my career at the University of Virginia as a professor of electrical & computer engineering, including stints as department chair and the UVA engineering school's director of cross-cutting initiatives. I came to GW in 2019 to serve as dean of GW Engineering and had 6 glorious months before COVID. But we made it through, and these last 6 years as dean have been some of the most rewarding and enjoyable of my career.

One of the things I was most excited about when President Granberg asked me to take on this role was the opportunity to get to know more about our world-class university community. I have had the fortune of either meeting for the first time or getting to work more closely with many members of our community since beginning in this role, including many Faculty Senators, and I continue to be amazed by how committed our community is to advancing GW's mission with excellence. Our staff are highly experienced, our faculty are dedicated educators and top scholars in their fields, and our students are not only academically strong but also have an incredible commitment to societal impact.

I was able to witness this broad expertise early in the semester by participating in a series of programs like our Institute for Citizen Leaders and the Welcome Day of Service, and I was thrilled to greet our new faculty and academic leaders during our start of year orientation sessions.

You learned from President Granberg's report that, despite the challenges we face, we will continue to pursue our mission with excellence, and we are optimistic about the year ahead. We will launch the Strategic Framework, continue to support the incredible scholarship of our faculty, and remain ever dedicated to the personal, professional, and intellectual growth of our students.

I said in my start of semester message that it is part of our very DNA to offer a welcoming and supportive environment for those with a variety of perspectives and identities so that all can succeed and thrive here. This includes giving space for civil discourse and constructive dialogue so that we can challenge each other while making our university community stronger, and advance knowledge to make our world a better place. Of course, academic freedom plays a critical role in this and in our ability to fulfill our personal and professional goals and in supporting others in doing the same, while all working together to advance our university mission with excellence.

I know that many around the university are hard at work building upon these efforts. For example, the Division for Student Affairs has partnered with the Constructive Dialogue Institute to host dialogue groups

with first-year students, and numerous GW 101 instructors have embedded a dialogue framework into their courses.

I plan to say more in the coming weeks and months about building upon this foundation and continuing to strengthen both our university community and our ability to pursue our mission with excellence.

A bit more about me, my worldview, and my approach to academic leadership.

My PhD is in Electrical Engineering, and as I said I've spent the last 25 years as a professor of electrical and computer engineering, but my undergraduate degree was in a program called Science, Technology, and Society. For those who aren't familiar, it is exactly what it sounds like - we studied science and technology in a societal context, and society is a science and technology context. Some of my favorite classes were Ethics and Technology, Gender and Technology, Technology & Economic Change, but the mantra of that program - really, its ethos - which still rings in my head almost every day when I see the potential for "progress" - is "progress towards what? and for whom?" Given any notion of technological innovation or progress, we as students had to answer that question - progress towards what and for whom? That question wasn't meant to throw a wet blanket on innovation or progress. Rather, it was a reminder that we as a society - and certainly we as a university of scholars and educators - need to ask and answer that question as we work to create a better world.

I also believe in "bridging the silos," as society's most challenging problems require working across disciplines. You'll note that I said "bridging" - not "breaking" or "tearing down" - the silos, as I believe in the power of disciplines, and all successful interdisciplinary initiatives are built upon strong disciplinary foundations. But as we as a university pursue research with true societal impact and prepare students to be strong and resilient leaders for the mid-21st century, we *must* work to bridge the silos and move forward as OneGW.

A final note about my approach to leadership - I believe in something I call "strategy-based empowerment." This stems from my belief that a university's strength lies in its people, and an academic leader's focus should be on empowering those people to do great things. But we also can't be just a collection of individuals, so that empowerment should be grounded in a strategy. That is one of the reasons I'm so excited about the strategic framework and the commitment to source, nurture, and support great ideas that come from our community and advance our collective strategy.

That is also why I am eager to foster a culture and regular practice of the administration consulting the Faculty Senate and other relevant stakeholder groups in relevant university matters. Our community has valuable ideas, expertise, and perspectives that should shape our thinking and that will lead us to better decision making. President Granberg and I are committed to working with all of you to make that happen, and I look forward to many productive conversations this year.

Now, onto some business.

Middle States

As you may recall, the Middle States Self-Study reaccreditation process began last year. Key milestones that have taken place since the self-study's launch include the selection of the Steering Committee; the creation and launch of 7 working groups focused on each of the Middle States Standards for Accreditation; a campus

visit in April by our Middle States liaison Michael Bowden; and work by our faculty working groups to gather documentation, along with the finalization of the self-study design draft over the summer.

This fall, Middle States work continues. Our working groups have begun to draft chapters of GW's self-study, and the Middle States steering committee will soon invite the entire community to a town hall to engage our students, faculty, and staff in its work. The Steering Committee will also engage key leadership groups, including the Student Government Association, Staff Council, and, of course, the Faculty Senate. A draft of the self-study will be ready by the summer for the community's review and feedback.

There is more information to come on this critical initiative. For now, I'd like to express my gratitude to the Steering Committee and the working groups for the many hours of hard work they are putting into data collection, writing, and leading the charge on this critical effort.

Budget Model

We also continue to make progress on the new GW budget model.

As a reminder of what we have done to date:

- We established a new budget model Faculty Advisory Group that includes representation from all 10 schools and colleges, as well as having Susan Kulp and Joe Cordes as the faculty leaders of that advisory group. As you know, they co-chair the Faculty Senate Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Subcommittee.
- We have been working with Grant Thornton to survey AAU and broader industry peers for best practices in their approaches to their own budget models.
- We have developed a new budget model framework in partnership with the President, cabinet, deans, and the Faculty Advisory Group.
- We are now unpacking the many details of how the budget model will work under this framework, including the mechanics of revenue and expense allocations, the enablement of transparency and multi-year planning, the governance policies & procedures to ensure effective operation, the evaluation of a new software tool to modernize our analytics and reporting, and ensuring that the budget model is constructed in a manner that supports our Strategic Framework and university aspirations.

Next steps include soliciting feedback from the President, cabinet, and deans in October based on the progress to date for these elements. We will also continue to convene the Faculty Advisory Group along with Susan and Joe in September/October and beyond.

This feedback loop will then continue to be incorporated into the budget model over several months. We are anticipating a concurrent process in FY27 to iron out any potential issues and a full implementation by FY28.

Science and Engineering Hall

As you are aware, a broken water valve in the Science and Engineering Hall Greenhouse over the weekend caused significant flooding in the building. Our dedicated staff have worked around the clock to address issues, restore access to spaces, and ensure the integrity of research in the building. The majority of offices,

classrooms, and laboratories are available for occupancy. All elevators remain out of service due to ongoing repairs except the ones in the parking garage.

Campus Facilities and Operations has confirmed that all areas affected by water damage, including the rear of the labs, have been inspected. The team is contacting department stakeholders to schedule further repairs, as workbenches and equipment will need to be moved to accommodate these repairs. Repairs to office spaces are planned for completion within the next few weeks. I am very grateful to the many staff and faculty who responded to this situation so quickly in order to return SEH to regular operations. We will continue to provide updates when they are available.

Resolution 26/2, A Resolution on Prioritizing Education at GW

Finally, I'd like to take a moment to comment on the Educational Policy & Technology Committee's Resolution on Prioritizing Education at GW, which will be introduced later in the agenda. This resolution touches on the cost of the Gallup survey called My Voice at GW and recommends the use of in-house faculty and staff expertise when conducting surveys.

I would like to clarify that GW contracted with Gallup in 2020 to conduct this faculty and staff survey and that the contract was completely paid in 2024; no funds were spent this fiscal year. This year's round of surveying is the final year of the contract.

As I said earlier, I believe strongly that a university's strength lies in its people and that our community has valuable ideas, expertise, and perspectives that should shape our thinking and that will lead to better decision making. Following consultation with both the outgoing and incoming Faculty Senate Chairs in 2022, Human Resource Management and Development and Gallup met with more than 400 benefits-eligible faculty and staff members through a series of town hall sessions during the Gallup initiative. An executive committee worked to shape the survey process and ensure this initiative was transparent and represented the voice of the broader GW community. Following the conclusion of this year's survey, we look forward to briefing the Faculty Senate, the staff council, and the rest of the university community on how different units have worked to address issues identified in the survey results. And going forward, we should absolutely leverage our faculty's expertise in how we approach such assessments.

President Granberg, this concludes my report.



Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)
Katrin Schultheiss, Chair
September 12, 2025

FSEC Activities

Over the summer, FSEC prepared and delivered charges to the Senate standing committees.

In late May, FSEC met to discuss two nonconcurrences and delivered its recommendations on the cases to the Provost. A final nonconcurrency arrived in the second half of June; FSEC delivered its recommendation on that case to Interim Provost Lach in mid-July.

At President Granberg's request, a special FSEC meeting was held on June 20. At that meeting, the President asked Provost Bracey to inform the group that the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD) had faced some year-over-year challenges in balancing the budget and had "exhausted...options of non-compensation budget." The central administration therefore came up with a series of recommendations that are currently being implemented, including the non-renewal of many of GSEHD's contract faculty. Provost Bracey also informed FSEC that some tenure-line faculty in GSEHD might not be awarded tenure. Secondly, during that meeting, President Granberg asked FSEC to weigh in on a possible University Professorship appointment, which FSEC agreed to consider during the fall semester.

On July 31, FSEC met with Interim Provost Lach to provide feedback on the selected candidate for Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Following that meeting, FSEC sent a memo to Interim Provost Lach summarizing the meeting, including concerns raised around the process; that memo will be attached to this report for inclusion with the minutes of this meeting.

Following the leadership's July memo to the university regarding budget challenges, FSEC engaged in extensive discussions, ultimately requesting that the President call a special Senate meeting to discuss the fiscal challenges facing the university. This meeting took place on August 12. FSEC greatly appreciates the great willingness and flexibility of the administration to schedule this meeting during an especially challenging point on the calendar.

Prior to the special meeting, the Senate standing committees were invited to submit questions to the administration. Additional questions were received following the meeting. A compiled list of those questions—sorted by topic but otherwise unedited—were included with the agenda for today's meeting and will be included with the minutes of this meeting. On August 28, FSEC met to work through the full, compiled list and identify items for prioritization with the administration; both the full list of questions and the primary themes were communicated to the President with a request that she speak to those themes in today's meeting. The document of prioritized questions was also included with the agenda posting for today's meeting and will be included with the meeting minutes. More detailed questions from the compiled list are being brought to the Senate standing committees—from

where most of the questions originated—for more in-depth work with the administration.

FSEC held its regular meeting on August 22 to set the agenda for today's Senate meeting and to receive updates from the administration and standing committee liaisons on recent activities. The President outlined plans for several administrative working groups on various issues and asked FSEC to assist in nominating faculty members to serve on these working groups; she shared that similar requests for nominations would be sent out to faculty via the deans. FSEC expressed its concern about the selection process for the working groups via a memo to the President and Interim Provost; that memo will also be attached to this report for inclusion with the minutes of today's meeting.

Immediately following its August 22 meeting, FSEC engaged in a listening session with the search firm retained for the Provost search. The search firm will be invited to a future Senate meeting to brief the full group on the Provost search.

Just after the start of classes this semester, CCAS faculty received a memo from the Dean's office regarding a new requirement for mid-term grade reporting in order to comply with the Department of Education's audit of the university's federal student aid policy. This message was apparently sent prematurely, but this generated discussion among FSEC, the Educational Policy & Technology (EPT) committee, and the administration given the strong concern of faculty around a grading policy change apparently put into effect without any consultation with the faculty. EPT, Deputy Provost Murphy, and Registrar Cloud are now working together on a more appropriate compliance mechanism. On Tuesday of this week, FSEC shared a memo with the Interim Provost outlining their concerns with the lack of faculty consultation on a matter directly impacting the academic enterprise. That memo, and Interim Provost Lach's response, will be attached to this report for inclusion with the minutes of today's meeting.

In Memoriam

Professor John Boswell passed away on June 5, 2025, at the age of 93. Professor Boswell received his undergraduate degree in Education from GW in 1953. After serving two years in the United States Navy, he taught at McLean High School, during which time he earned his master's degree in Education from GW (1956). He began teaching at GW while working on his doctoral degree in Education (1963) and remained there as a tenured Professor of Education for over 50 years. Professor Boswell served on the Senate for twelve academic years between 1967-2001 and was an active member of multiple standing committees. He served on the executive committee between 1994-2001, two of those years as chair. In Professor Boswell's obituary, his family emphasized that he relished his academic life, and, most importantly, his many students.

Personnel Actions

There are no active grievances at the university.

Calendar

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is October 3, 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 September 26, 2025.

The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting is October 24, 2025 at 3pm. Please note that this date and time represent a change to the previously approved Senate schedule. This change was made in response to a request from the Board of Trustees office following a change in their fall meeting schedule. Holding the Senate meeting on October 24 ensures that the Senate will receive timely updates from the Board meeting, which will be held on October 17.



Faculty Senate

August 1, 2025

To: John Lach, Interim Provost

From: Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)

Re: July 31 meeting to discuss the appointment of Emily Hammond to the position of Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

The majority of FSEC members offered no position on the merits or substance of the appointment of Emily Hammond. A minority felt that the urgency of putting someone in place quickly, especially someone with extensive experience in the position, justified the appointment of Dr. Hammond on an interim basis.

The group expressed a range of concerns about the process leading to the decision to nominate Professor Hammond for the position including:

- Decision to not hold an open search for the permanent position;
- Lack of consultation with FSEC on selection of candidate(s) for the position; and
- Presentation of a single candidate for the position.

FSEC recommended:

- That the central administration work to expand and improve meaningful consultation with FSEC on administrative appointments and other matters affecting the mission of the university in accordance with best practices of shared governance. In general, faculty consultation is preferred before decisions are made or strong preferences are developed and expressed from leadership; and
- That the Provost initiate an open, internal search for the permanent position of Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs as soon as possible.

Generally, FSEC accepts and defers to decisions by leadership in exceptional and emergency situations when immediate actions and interim appointments may be necessary.



Faculty Senate

August 27, 2025

Dear President Granberg and Interim Provost Lach:

We are writing to express our concern about the process of selecting faculty members for the "working groups" that you mentioned at the Aug. 22 FSEC meeting, especially the "Working Group on Federal Matters." (Because of the time constraints on the meeting, we did not have time to fully discuss the process for populating the "working groups.") It has long been considered best practice for groups representing faculty to be picked by the faculty - not deans and other administrators. Faculty selected by faculty are in a far better position to have the trust of their peers than would a group of faculty chosen by administrators. Moreover, it would be regrettable if a group selected by administrators were to reach materially different conclusions from what a faculty selected faculty committee would conclude. On important matters such as the DoJ negotiations, many faculty senators would likely not accept consultation with a group selected by administrators as genuine faculty consultation.

The Senate's committee structure offers the most straightforward and logical path to genuine faculty consultation. We were glad to hear that Provost Lach has already met with the PEAFF committee with regard to the DoJ letter. We hope that you will continue to pursue deep engagement with PEAFF (or a committee-selected subset of PEAFF) and possibly other Senate committees as well depending on how the negotiations with the DoJ proceed. We also urge you to work with the Senate committees with respect to the other four "working groups." Faculty Senate standing committees have a long record of successful consultation with appropriate confidentiality. Their meaningful participation in this process would help build trust and strengthen shared governance at this crucial and precarious time.

In sum, the FSEC urges the administration to work with suitable Faculty Senate committees to address the issues assigned to the "working groups" rather than rely on faculty chosen by administrators. Thank you in advance for your willingness to engage substantively with faculty who share your profound concern about the future of our institution.

Sincerely,
2025-2026 Faculty Senate Executive Committee



Faculty Senate

September 9, 2025

Dear Provost Lach:

We are writing to express our profound concern about the process by which GW administrators developed a plan to comply with the Department of Education's audit of the university's federal student aid policy. According to Deputy Provost Terry Murphy and Vice Provost Jay Goff, the audit was initiated in 2023 and plans for how to meet the government's reporting requirements have been discussed and developed for many months. At no point was the Faculty Senate consulted or engaged in any way in this process despite the fact that any proposal would involve changes to course syllabi and classroom practices. Moreover, the new mandatory faculty reporting measure was announced as a short item with no explanation in a single email from the CCAS Dean's office to CCAS faculty after the semester had already started. While the CCAS Dean's office is to be commended for its transparency on an issue of immediate relevance to instructional matters, many faculty in other colleges remain completely unaware of the new reporting requirement even though we have now entered week three of the semester and the announced policy stipulates reporting grades between weeks four and six.

We understand that Deputy Provost Murphy and Registrar Cloud are working with the EPT Committee to devise a more appropriate compliance mechanism and implementation schedule. We are dismayed, however, that such consultation only occurred *after* the EPT and FSEC raised objections and believe that early and substantive consultation with the EPT Committee would have brought forth alternative solutions for compliance, thus avoiding the current confusion.

Last year, the Senate worked with university leadership to establish guidelines for developing and updating policies, culminating in [Senate Resolution 25/2](#) and in [Guidelines for University Policy Review Process](#). We look forward to working with leadership on future policy revisions accordingly. New procedures often require intentional effort to institutionalize. We respectfully request that administrators be reminded of the processes outlined in these documents so we can avoid future lapses.

We look forward to working with leadership to build stronger practices of faculty consultation and shared governance.

Sincerely,
2025-2026 Faculty Senate Executive Committee

~*~

September 10, 2025

Dear FSEC,

Thank you very much for your email. I agree with you 100% that the Faculty Senate (the EPT Committee in particular) should have been consulted as options were being considered for addressing the Department of Education's concerns. In fact, I asked if such consultation had been done when I learned of the issue a couple of weeks ago, as I firmly believe that such consultation leads to better decision making, especially on issues that directly impact academic affairs. As such, I am eager to do as you suggest and foster a culture and regular practice of the Administration consulting the Senate (and other relevant stakeholder groups) in such matters going forward. President Granberg and I are committed to working with all of you to make that happen.

Regarding the path forward for the midterm grading issue, Deputy Provost Murphy and Registrar Cloud are indeed working with the EPT Committee on a solution, implementation, and communications plan. I understand that they are making progress and will hopefully have an update soon.

Thanks again for reaching out,
John

Board of Trustees Executive and Finance & Investments Committee members

Grace E. Speights, Chair
Ellen Zane, Vice Chair
Ave Tucker, Secretary
Christine Barth
Roslyn Brock
Mark Chichester

Amr ElSawy
A. Michael Hoffman
Madeleine Jacobs
Todd Klein
George Wellde
Thomas LeBlanc, President

June 4, 2020

Dear Members of the Board of Trustees Executive Committee and Finance Committee, and President LeBlanc,

This letter is prompted by the current and expanding financial difficulties faced by the university and the letter from Board Chair Speights to the George Washington University on May 18, 2020.

In her letter, Chair Speights called for “transformational thinking and best practices” in order to “safeguard the future and continue to promote the excellence of the George Washington University for generations to come.” To that end, Chair Speights asked for a framework that includes changes to operations as well as “permanent measures that have a lasting impact and sustain our course to preeminence in full recognition that the future will look very different from the past.” In looking at permanent measures, Chair Speights asked that they include “materially improving the operations and financial efficiency beyond minor changes that would normally be implemented in a less severe financial downturn.”

Recognizing that to date there have been no substantive proposals for structural changes communicated from the administration to us, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has developed a range of possible short- and long-term changes, which are contained in the two attached documents.

We want to emphasize that ordinarily, before sending the Board such proposals, we would have engaged in a robust substantive discussion with members of the Senate, committee chairs, and other interested faculty. However, because of the gravity of the situation and the urgent need to begin taking steps to maintain GW's financial health, we decided to convey the attached proposals based solely upon the consent of the members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

We share these with the hope that the items listed can be on the table for discussion as the Board considers the FY21 budget it will adopt for GW in the coming days and weeks.

The enumeration below arises from three principles:

1. The university should protect its core missions of world class research and education. GW's central mission is promoting the expansion and transmission of knowledge. As framed by Chair Speights in her email of May 18, 2020, GW's mission is to “educate and increase knowledge through research and scholarship.” Therefore, cuts in the current situation should begin in areas outside of the core mission. Structural changes should occur first to non-core areas and to areas that are not revenue-generating.

2. It is important to distinguish between what may be a short-term adverse financial situation and longer-term changes in revenue and expenditures.
3. Budget revisions that require structural changes in the university's research and educational activities should not be made on a hasty basis and should not be done without the joint consultations of the trustees, administration, and faculty. Therefore, plans—budgetary or otherwise—for reacting to COVID-19 should be circulated and discussed by trustees, faculty, and administration for at least two weeks prior to finalization.

To this end, we would like to offer to the Board of Trustees and the administration some suggestions for a range of operational improvements, cost savings, and even methods of new revenue generation. Collectively, these changes can secure GW's long-term health and position as a globally recognized center of research and education.

In their letter of March 4, 2020, Grace Speights and Thomas LeBlanc committed to “meaningful communication and consultation with the faculty before making important academic decisions of shared governance.” It is in that spirit of consultation that the following are offered. Members of the faculty would be pleased and prepared to discuss these directly with Board at any time.

Below, please find two documents:

Attachment I – A list of possible savings of \$21.5M in one-time savings, and an additional \$33.2M in structural, yearly savings.

Attachment II – New possible sources of revenue of \$94M per year.

Sincerely,

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Attachment I. Savings

1. Direct and deferred compensation.

1.a. Eliminate all university bonuses for both FY20 and FY21.

Rationale: The announced cuts to administrative compensation have a duration only from July 1 2020 to the end of 2020. Announced cuts do not include any cuts to bonuses, deferred, and non-salary compensation in FY 2020 or FY21.

Estimated savings (one time): \$1.5M.

1.b. Permanently end university contribution to [457\(f\) plans](#). For executives, key, and highest compensated employees, also terminate all university payments for benefits not regularly available to faculty and staff, including but not limited to retention bonuses, severance packages, supplemental annuities, supplemental differed compensation, gross up payments, additional insurance, tax and legal services, tickets to athletic and cultural events, membership fees, first class air fare, travel expenses for family members, car allowance, and any post-employment benefits or payments not generally available to GWU employees.

Rationale: Equity and Efficiency. Core programs should be protected above maintaining special compensation for the most highly paid. [The 2017 Tax Cut and Jobs Act assesses a 21 percent excise tax on the compensation of nonprofit executives in excess of \\$1 million.](#)

Estimated structural savings: \$700K/year

1.c. Reset downward, on a permanent basis, executive and administrative compensation within central administration and colleges. Establish cuts to headcount, to salary base, to deferred compensation, and to bonuses. Ensure that GWU pays zero in excise tax for compensation.

Rationale:

- If there is fat to be cut in compensation, it is not in faculty salaries or staffing levels. Indeed, while GW is almost the most efficient of its peers in this regard,¹ administration has grown in both headcount and per-person compensation.²
- At many higher education institutions, the ratio of the President's salary to Full Professor salaries is approximately 5:1. Is it higher or lower at GW and, if higher, what savings would be achieved by setting the GW President's compensation to 5x the national average Full Professor salary?
- What effects would cutting the President's compensation have on the compensation of other administrators at GW, and what collective long-term savings would be achieved?
- There has been some inflation of central administration in both headcount and salaries, whereas it is unclear that recent hiring was done on a competitive basis, given that a number of executives were previously connected with President LeBlanc. Indeed, the university hired an associate provost even after the COVID-19 imposed hiring freeze. Using 2015 as baseline, in real dollars, how are our expenditures now vs then? How much would be saved

¹ https://provost.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs626/f/Core%20indicators_2019.pdf, p.17-18.

² According to the 990 forms, in FY2015 the GWU Provost had compensation of \$[1,050,411 plus \\$159,732](#) in deferred compensation. In the same fiscal year, the Harvard Provost had total compensation of \$[867,080](#).

if the university started by reducing executive and central payroll, but by using the 2015 costs as a baseline?

Estimated structural savings: \$1.5M/year

1.d. Pause merit increases for one year

Rationale: already announced.

Estimated savings (one time): \$20M

2. Elimination of Costs outside of Core Mission

2.a. Eliminate competitive athletics

Rationale:

- Some schools like Notre Dame and University of Miami draw students because of their athletics program. GWU is not like those schools. GWU is like schools such as NYU where the competitive advantage in drawing students is its location, not its athletics. Students who care much about competitive athletics will seek to attend schools in the conferences like Big 10, SEC, or ACC, but not GWU. Additionally, competitive athletics is a money loser, even from the perspective of donations. Further, elimination of competitive athletics would also eliminate the need for the new aquatics and athletics facility proposed in the [new campus master plan](#).
- The effective cost per student of competitive athletics of more than \$1,500/year serves a small portion of the student body and would be better spent on core educational and research mission that address a larger group of the undergraduates.

Estimated structural savings: \$20M/year

2.b. End expenditures for events outside of GW space

Rationale: Off-campus space rental (including departmental retreats) and on-campus tents for special events lead to under-utilization of GW facilities. Currently, costs are out of control because of the inefficient structure of GW budget practices. GW units are charged to use GW spaces, effectively encouraging them to seek outside rentals and therefore transfer funds outside the university.

Estimated structural savings: \$1M/year

2.c. Scale back expenditures on consulting activities

Rationale: GW purchased services are currently around \$180M/year. According to the Educational Advisory Board (EAB), high-end consultancy engagements have small impact and unclear ROI. The problem of wasted consultancy fees seems to apply especially for general consulting firms (e.g., Disney) which do not have a deep and longer-term knowledge of the higher education sector and therefore seem to provide generic advice.³ President LeBlanc already informed the Faculty Senate that the Disney Institute contract had reached its conclusion this spring.

Estimated structural savings: \$9M/year.

³ EAB “Efficiency and Effectiveness Initiatives: What Business Leaders Should Know About Higher Education’s Million-Dollar Consulting Engagements”, 2019.

2.d. Scale back expenditures on campus beautification

Rationale: Beautification is not necessary for maintenance and should be scaled back or eliminated before any cuts to core activities are considered.

Estimated structural savings: \$1M/year

Sum of potential structural savings: \$33.2M/year

Sum of one-time savings (freeze in merit increases for faculty and staff and elimination of executive bonuses in both FY20 and FY21) = \$20M+\$1.5M = **\$21.5M**

One-year savings (structural savings from first year = \$33.2M + one-time savings) = **\$54.7M**

Attachment II. New Structural Revenues

1. Tuition Income

1.a. Increase summer tuition revenue for grad and undergrad, consider requiring undergraduates to spend a summer in DC.

Rationale: The single most important distinguishing factor of a GW education is its DC location. There could be a strategic educational value in having a summer program. Increased emphasis on a summer in-residence program would offer many good curricular and co-curricular opportunities not normally available during term time, especially if undergraduates are taking only one class at a time. One of the lessons from COVID-19 is that there is great demand for summer enrollment. So too might summer enrollments for grad students be increased.

Expected new yearly revenue: \$10M/year

1.b. Permanently abandon the plan to cut enrollment.

Rationale: President LeBlanc wisely recognized the emergency posed by COVID-19. Therefore, he announced to faculty in early April 2020 that all efforts to reduce undergraduate enrollment would be on hold and would not be considered again until the university had the chance to relaunch the strategic planning process. Given that Chair Speights now calls for structural changes, one such change would be to permanently abandon the enrollment reduction efforts. According to President LeBlanc, the cut to enrollment will cost about \$64M over 4 years. Taking the reduced revenue as a baseline implies that abandoning the 20% enrollment cut is new revenue.

Expected new revenue: \$64M/year

2. Efficiency

2.a. Make Development Office and its activities more efficient.

Rationale: President LeBlanc has announced that development activities should be justified based on their ROI. Faculty support this reorientation. However, [GWU fundraising is falling behind its peers](#). According to its 2017 Form 990, GWU spent \$22.6 M and brought in \$68M. This a 30% expense ratio. [The national standard is closer to 15%](#). The university might increase the ROI and effectiveness of the development office and thereby decrease its expense ratio from 30% to 25%.

Estimated New revenue: \$20M/year

Sum of new structural revenues: \$94M / year

--

Approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
June 4, 2020



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 Grynawski (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

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.



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). 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?