

The George Washington University Faculty Senate
President's Report Pre-Read
Meeting Date: Friday, October 24, 2025

Given the timing of the meeting and the number of items on the agenda, I appreciate the opportunity to submit this written report in advance to allocate more time during the meeting for questions and discussion. I welcome your feedback on whether this format would work better for future meetings as well.

President's Report - Administrative Updates

- Compact for Excellence in Higher Education
- Fall 2025 Enrollment Update
- Budget Update
- MFA Update
- Faculty Excellence
- University Leadership Update
- U.S. News and World Report Rankings
- Sustainability Tracking, Assessment, and Rating System (STARS) Platinum Rating

PRESIDENT'S REPORT - ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES

Compact for Excellence in Higher Education

The White House proposed the "Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education" on October 1, 2025. It was initially sent to nine universities, offering them preferential federal funding in exchange for agreeing to a series of policy changes dictated by the administration with a deadline for responses of Monday, October 20. As of the writing of this report, all but two universities have rejected the compact, variously citing their commitment to their values, academic freedom and mission.

This is in addition to responses from organizations representing the interests of higher education. The American Council on Education and 35 other higher education organizations issued a joint statement urging the administration to withdraw the proposed compact, warning it would harm both higher education and the nation. Their action follows growing campus resistance, including faculty and student rallies and a separate statement from the American Association of Colleges and Universities condemning the compact. Together, these associations—representing the breadth of U.S. higher education—signaled a united front against the proposal.

As the university shared in the [Weekly Federal Update](#) on October 17, we are aware of recent news reports about the compact for academic excellence in higher education. We would like to clarify that GW has not been invited to comment on or adopt the compact, and we are not considering adopting it. What we *are* doing is actively discussing GW's values, principles, and priorities, and how they relate to the important issues and the broader challenges faced by all of higher education.

Fall 2025 Enrollment Update

Our official fall census was completed on Saturday, October 4, and I'm pleased to report that our total student headcount stands at just over 24,500. Undergraduate and professional full-time enrollments are steady with last fall and remain in line with our planning estimates. We also saw an increase in full-time domestic graduate enrollment, which is a positive sign amid a challenging national environment for graduate education.

As I shared last month, we exceeded our new undergraduate enrollment goal when we welcomed 2,697 new first-year and transfer students in August. These students come from across the United States and around the world. They bring strong academic credentials, impressive leadership experience, and a genuine commitment to community, both here in Foggy Bottom and across the D.C. area.

I want to thank our undergraduate admissions and financial aid teams for their exceptional work during a very complex admissions cycle. They brought in another outstanding incoming class that reflects the best of GW.

As expected, we did experience declines in overall graduate enrollment this fall. We are down approximately 420 international graduate and professional students and just over 300 part-time master's students. These shifts are tied to ongoing international visa delays and recent workforce changes in the region.

As a result of the graduate registrations, our total degree-seeking student enrollment is down about 3.3% compared to the Fall 2024 census.

GW's enrollment support teams will continue to process financial aid requests through mid-November, and we are working closely with students to ensure continued access and support.

Overall, despite the external pressures, our core enrollment remains stable, and our student body continues to represent the global academic excellence and civic commitment that have always defined the George Washington University.

Budget Update

The work to manage the FY26 budget deficit is going well. As of the date of this report, we are ahead of projections on spending reductions. Revenue is also matching projections, but final information is not yet available due to late enrollments and a larger than normal number of financial aid appeals. We will be providing an update on the FY26 budget and our efforts to reduce our structural deficit before the end of the semester.

MFA Update

As was announced recently, we have made some important progress on our negotiations regarding the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA). We have reached an initial agreement with Universal Health Services (UHS) to provide co-funding for the MFA both during the negotiations and through the conclusion of a definitive agreement, assuming we are able to get there. This has been a crucial requirement for GW to continue negotiating and will allow us to focus on the other aspects of an agreement that are important to GW and the MFA such as the academic enterprise, including research and training of School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) students, and the quality of the facilities at GW University Hospital (GWUH), among other issues.

All parties remain committed to preserving services during the negotiations including high-quality training of medical students and patient care at GWUH, Cedar Hill Regional Medical Center, and affiliated outpatient sites.

It is important to underscore that this is not a done deal. We have many complicated issues to work through in this next phase of the negotiations, and the input and perspective of physicians and GW faculty will be invaluable to this process. Representatives from MFA, including faculty leadership at SMHS, will be actively involved in these discussions.

Faculty Excellence and Innovation in Teaching

GW's academic distinction continues to grow through the accomplishments of our faculty and the vitality of our scholarly community.

I want to start by congratulating Dayna Matthew, Dean of the Law School, and Monika Kumari Goyal, professor of pediatrics and emergency medicine, who were officially inducted into the National Academy of Medicine on Saturday, October 18. This is a tremendous honor and well-deserved recognition that reflect not only on the quality of their work but on our entire academic enterprise.

In mid-September, we celebrated the tenure and promotion of 105 faculty members with a reception at F Street House. As you know, tenure and promotion represent the culmination of a demanding, years-long process of review and a demonstration of excellence, and for the university, these milestones signify our own high standards and commitment to supporting and awarding excellence.

This fall, we also celebrated the installation of three endowed professors in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, recognizing their contributions to research, clinical excellence, and education. I am pleased to congratulate:

- Dr. Henry Kaminski, who was named the Jeffrey Lieberman Professor of Neurosciences;
- Dr. Terry Kind who was named the Frank N. Miller, MD, Distinguished Teaching Professor; and
- Dr. Mohamad Koubeissi who was named the Meta Amalia Neumann Professor of Neurology.

We also marked the installation of Professor Mary-Rose Papandrea as the Burchfield Professor of First Amendment and Free Speech Law. As the battle over free speech reshapes society and civil rights are tested in new and complex ways, this distinguished professorship sits at the intersection of some of the most consequential legal issues of our era. It was a measure of the importance of the occasion—and GW’s powerful role as a convener—that retired Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer attended and made remarks in conversation with GW Law Professor Jeff Rosen who also serves as President and CEO of the National Constitution Center,

In the same vein, GW’s annual Teaching Day brought faculty together to share innovative teaching practices with a special focus on fostering constructive dialogue and helping our students wrestle with difficult questions, not avoid them. As a sociologist who spent years teaching in a very conservative red state, I know firsthand how challenging it can be to introduce—and sustain—conversations about difficult or divisive topics. But I also know that those conversations, when handled with care, can be transformative and I thank and applaud those who organized this event and who took the time to participate.

University Leadership Update

I’m pleased to welcome Kelly Gebo, who joined the university earlier this month as the dean of the Milken Institute School of Public Health.

Regarding the search for the university’s next provost, during September the search advisory committee held 11 community forums, both in person and virtual, for faculty, staff and students. This was an opportunity for the community to provide input on the qualities they hope to see in GW’s next provost. With that input, the committee has finalized the position profile, and I reviewed it earlier this week. The search firm is placing ads in different higher education publications and is currently accepting applications.

U.S. News and World Report Rankings

I would like to highlight the university’s recent jump in U.S. News & World Report rankings. GW moved up 4 places to 59th, which represents GW’s highest position in the rankings since 2019. Rankings are fickle and should always be taken with a grain of salt. This year, however, GW’s move into a higher tier group reflected meaningful progress on some important measures of success, most notably a higher graduation rate among our Pell-eligible students.

GW also earned top 100 spots on several USNWR “best of” lists, including a No. 30 ranking for study abroad. GW was also ranked 90th for Best Colleges for Veterans, a two-spot improvement from last year, and 93rd for Best Value Schools.

Sustainability Tracking, Assessment, and Rating System (STARS) Platinum Rating

Lastly, I am very pleased to share that GW recently earned a Platinum rating in the Sustainability Tracking, Assessment, and Rating System (STARS), fulfilling a sustainability commitment that was made by the Board of Trustees in 2020.

GW is only the ninth U.S. university to hold the STARS Platinum distinction, and fewer than 3% of all institutions that participate in STARS have earned a Platinum rating. The STARS Platinum rating is the result of a multi-year effort to expand and enhance GW’s academic and co-curricular programs, operating policies and procedures, and resource conservation and efficiency efforts.

GW’s commitment to sustainability is transforming our campus. In September, I joined a group of students and university leaders to officially inaugurate the Backyard at Square 80, a brand-new, student-designed pocket park that reclaims a historic backyard at the heart of GW’s Foggy Bottom campus. The concept and design for the park originated with a group of students in a sustainability capstone course who recognized the hidden potential of the space. Then the Division of Safety and Operations developed a scope of work to align with the students’ vision and oversaw construction of the project.



Faculty Senate October Meeting
Interim Provost Lach Report
Friday, October 24, 2025

Middle States Re-Accreditation Update

As you know, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (Middle States) is GW's institutional accreditor recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. As the institutional accreditor, Middle States requires evaluation of all aspects of the institution holistically, including the modality of instruction as well as all academic programs and services. GW fully expects to be re-accredited. It is common, however, for the Commission to require institutions to conduct follow up work on one or more of the standards.

Universities accredited by Middle States undergo a comprehensive evaluation at least every eight years. This regular review process involves an institutional self-study, an on-site visit by a peer evaluation team, and a subsequent review and decision by the Commission to reaffirm or adjust the institution's accreditation status.

GW was last evaluated in 2018. During the 2024-25 academic year, we launched the self-study by selecting co-chairs for the review committee and created a study design, and the Middle States vice president met with the university community, including Board members.

During this academic year,

- Seven working groups have been formed and are researching GW's compliance with Middle States' standards. These working groups are meeting with stakeholders, gathering information, and analyzing data. Most of them will submit draft chapters to the Steering Committee by the end of the spring semester;
- The Steering Committee will hold an information session for the university community on Thursday, October 30 from 9:30-10:30 in the University Student Center, Room 403, with a virtual option for those who cannot attend in person. Engagement is also taking place with key groups, including Faculty Senate, Staff Council, and Student Government Association;
- The Steering Committee will complete a draft of the self-study; and
- A chair for the visiting team will be selected, with some input from the university.

Looking further out, the remaining timeline is below:

- Fall 2026 – Community comment period. Visiting team chair comes to campus.
- Spring 2027 – Visiting team comes to campus. Visit itinerary will include a meeting with a set of Board members.
- Summer 2027 – Final results provided.

Research Update

GW Research: Continuing an Upward Trend

GW remained a research powerhouse in FY2025, continuing its upward trajectory over the past 10 years. From FY2015 to 2024, GW's total federal R&D expenditures are up 29%, to just under \$180 million (Source: National Science Foundation Higher Education Research and Development (HERD) Survey). In addition, GW has the highest total federal R&D expenditures among all colleges and universities located in the nation's capital and is ranked #22 in social sciences among 400+ ranked institutions in total federal R&D expenditures.

Hallmarks of GW Faculty Excellence

- Citations of GW faculty publications are up 195% from 2015 to 2024
- 60+ GW-authored books published each year, on average, from 2014 to 2023 and GW ranks 8th among all AAU institutions on books published per faculty member
- 90+ highly prestigious awards, fellowships, and memberships, including in the National Academies and other Societies (2023)

A Culture of Innovation & Entrepreneurship

- GW is in the top 100 U.S. institutions granted utility patents (2024)
- Ranked #26 in patents per research expenditures (FY2023)
- 350+ new ventures created (since 2010)
- \$1.8B+ follow-on funding for GW-led startups (since 2010)
- \$100K+ in New Venture Competition prizes awarded (2025)

Impact of Federal Actions

As of October 21, 2025, GW has had 62 externally-funded awards terminated. 35 of those were direct awards, and 27 were subawards. These terminations span ten schools and units, with \$7.2 million in losses in the current period and \$10.5 million in losses in the out years. In close consultation with impacted PIs and legal counsel, GW has filed 17 appeals for reinstatement. Eight awards, three with GW as a prime recipient and five with GW as a subawardee, have been reinstated. We continue to track the status of pending appeals and file new ones after careful consideration.

Moving Forward: Generating Scholarship with Impact

At last month's Committee on Academic Affairs meeting, Interim Vice Provost for Research Robert Miller and I engaged trustees in a discussion on generating scholarship with impact in alignment with Priority One of the Strategic Framework. The robust conversation touched on numerous pathways for translating GW's original research and scholarship into broader societal impact. Some of these include:

- Technology Transfer
- Corporate, Government, and Community Partnerships
- Venture Creation and Entrepreneurship
- Publishing with Public Reach
- Policy Engagement

I look forward to hearing from the faculty about other ways that the university can better support their efforts to amplify the impact of their scholarship.

Office of Access and Opportunity Update

The Office of Access and Opportunity (OAO) was created in May 2025 with the launch of the updated Equal Opportunity, Nondiscrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Non-Retaliation Policy ("EO Policy") and supporting procedures. The EO Policy revisions and new procedures were informed by the community feedback received. OAO has oversight responsibility for the implementation and management of the EO Policy, related procedures, response, prevention, investigation, and compliance efforts. OAO provides central intake, review, and referral, which includes collaboration with other university units as needed.

Since the office's launch, we have received feedback from the community and considered lessons learned in our first months of experience with the OAO process. The office has posted [FAQs](#) in response to what they are hearing, and they are open to doing workshops with schools to help them learn how to navigate the process.

I look forward to further discussing OAO in the near future with the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) and then with the full Senate at a later meeting.

Federal Matters Engagement Update

On October 13, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Emily Hammond and Deputy General Counsel Richard Weitzner facilitated a workshop with members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), PEAFF, and the Committee on Appointment, Salary, & Promotion Policies (ASPP). In particular, faculty were asked to comment on the Columbia University and Brown University resolution agreements and the proposed federal compact and to provide input on how GW might respond to such issues. Notes were collected, and the administration greatly appreciates the faculty's valuable input on these important matters. On October 17, FSEC had a similar meeting with the GW Board of Trustees Executive Committee.

At September's Faculty Senate meeting, President Granberg announced the formation of a faculty Federal Matters Working Group to work under privilege with counsel to discuss these same issues. Nominations were submitted from FSEC and the chairs of ASPP and PEAFF, as well as from vice presidents and deans. Invitations were distributed to faculty members to serve on this working group, and the group was recently finalized. It includes at least one faculty member from each school as well as several members who were nominated by the Faculty Senate committees, and at the time of this report's submission we are working to schedule a kickoff meeting for late October.

Budget Model Update

We recently completed a two-part budget model discussion with the school deans. The budget model team and Grant Thornton met with the deans to provide an update on the budget model and answer clarifying questions and also discussed feedback and input that the deans provided on the most recent version of the budget model. We will continue to solicit feedback from other stakeholders in the coming weeks and months, including the faculty advisory group, led by Susan Kulp and Joe Cordes, which met most recently Wednesday, October 22, who are working closely with the new budget model development team.

Comment on Senate Resolution 25/9

Regarding [Senate Resolution 25/9](#), which I understand will be on the agenda for the Faculty Assembly next month, the Provost's Office has been in conversation with the chairs of PEAFF and ASPP about the values underlying the resolution. I am eager to work with the Faculty Senate and Academic Deans to explore these issues and to determine together the faculty composition that best enables GW to pursue its mission with excellence.

Comment on Academic Freedom

I frequently hear from faculty members who are anxious about the general state of academic freedom in higher education right now. As President Granberg said in her [community message](#) last week, academic freedom and freedom of expression are foundational to the mission of our university, as they protect the right of all members of our community to explore ideas and dialogue openly in the pursuit of knowledge. Our defense of academic freedom and free speech does not mean endorsing every view expressed on our campus, but rather upholding the conditions in which debate and discovery can flourish.

Part of my abovementioned meeting with PEAFF regarding OAO will be to discuss best practices for preserving academic freedom while investigating allegations of discrimination, bias, and harassment, as we need to be able to keep our campus free from such behaviors without having a chilling effect on academic freedom.

Community Engagement Update

Amidst my daily meetings and responsibilities, I have been fortunate to have opportunities to celebrate academic excellence and engage with our community on a personal level. As just a few examples:

- I was fortunate to participate in my first endowed professorship installation as interim provost on September 16 for the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, and it was a triple installation. Dr. Henry Kaminski was installed as the Jeffrey Lieberman Professor of Neurosciences, Dr. Terry Kind was installed as the Frank N. Miller, MD Distinguished Teaching Professor, and Dr. Mohamad Koubeissi was installed as the Meta Amalia Neumann Professor of Neurology.
- On September 24, President Granberg and I both participated in the installation of Mary-Rose Papandrea as the Burchfield Professor of First Amendment and Free Speech Law. This was a very special event that featured a fireside chat between President and CEO of the National Constitution Center and a GW Law professor, and Justice Stephen Breyer, Former Supreme Court Justice.
- I enjoyed previewing the new Strategic Framework at the GW Leaders Forum on October 9. I served on the Steering Committee of the Strategic Framework last year as dean of GW Engineering, so it was gratifying to present the deck to the university's leaders in my capacity as interim provost, and I'm excited to see the framework come to life.
- On October 20, I hosted my first Pizza with the Provost event, which was open to all GW students. It was an opportunity for students to get to know me a bit better, build trust, and engage openly in conversation about the GW community, the student experience, and their priorities for the academic year. I plan to host these on a regular basis and look forward to the next event in November at the Vern.



Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)
Katrin Schultheiss, Chair
October 24, 2025

FSEC Activities

On September 26, FSEC met with the chairs of the Senate standing committees to develop strategies for the Senate to act efficiently and effectively as a genuine shared governance body at a uniquely challenging moment for the university. Those present appreciated the level of detail provided in the September FSEC report to the Senate and discussed ways of communicating topics discussed and actions to the committee chairs more quickly following FSEC meetings. The group discussed the possibility of regular—likely twice per semester—meetings between FSEC and the committee chairs.

On October 1, FSEC received a memo from President Granberg detailing responses to the list of prioritized questions developed from the dozens of questions submitted by the Senate membership ahead of the August 12 special Senate meeting. Those responses were sent to Committee chairs and are attached to this report.

FSEC held its regular meeting on October 3 (with seven voting members and one non-voting member present) to set the agenda for today's Senate meeting and to receive updates from the administration and standing committee liaisons on recent activities. Topics discussed included the Department of Justice letter, the Trump administration's proposal to give some universities funding advantages in exchange for adopting the administration's policies, the Medical Faculty Associates, the working groups on federal and budget matters, safety on campus, matters pertaining to FSEC confidentiality, and academic freedom.

At its October 3 meeting, FSEC took two votes:

- To approve the October Senate agenda (6-1); and
- To amend Resolution 26/1 within FSEC (7-0)

FSEC subsequently voted on October 14 to place Resolution 26/1 on the agenda for today's meeting (7-0 with one abstention).

On October 17, FSEC participated in the regular joint meeting with the Board of Trustees Executive Committee. The main topic of discussion centered on the possible impact of federal policies on GW's research and teaching missions. FSEC members voiced a range of concerns including pointing out the disparate impact that various federal measures might have on the different schools. The group also discussed, more briefly, the financial challenges faced by the university. The Board and the faculty agreed on the need to seek increased financial support from non-government sources and highlighted the many benefits of direct faculty engagement with donors and potential donors. In addition, some difficulties were also expressed related to the interpretation of the PEAf report last year concerning FSEC confidentiality.

Additional Senate Activities

On October 13, 2025, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Emily Hammond and Deputy General Counsel Richard Weitzman hosted a workshop for members of FSEC, PEAFF, and ASPP to hear their views and ideas regarding federal matters, including the August 12, 2025 letter to GW from the Department of Justice, the Columbia and Brown settlement agreements with the Trump Administration, and the "Compact" that the Trump Administration offered to nine universities. These comments are being shared with university leadership. In addition, this workshop offered an opportunity for FSEC to understand colleagues' views and shape their own thinking in preparation for their October 17, 2025, meeting with the Board of Trustees, which focused on these topics.

The Senate has been invited to a privileged briefing on University Advancement with David Unruh, GW's new Vice President for University Advancement. This event will take place on Friday, November 7, and the Senate membership is invited to [submit advance questions](#).

Personnel Actions

There are no active grievances at the university.

Calendar

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is October 31, 2025. Draft resolutions and any other possible Senate agenda items should be forwarded to Liz Carlson in the Senate office as soon as possible, given that this meeting takes place one week from today. The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting is November 14, 2025, at 2pm.

October 1, 2025

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FR: President Ellen Granberg
Interim Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs John Lach

SU: Responses to prioritized questions

In response to the extraordinary confluence of political, economic and demographic challenges that are exacerbating a structural deficit in GW's budget, we hosted a special meeting of the Faculty Senate at its request this summer. Since we were unable to address the dozens of questions submitted by the Senate ahead of that session, and in recognition of the uniqueness of this moment, the administration agreed to provide additional responses to a set of questions prioritized by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), which are provided below.

Communication/Transparency:

1. 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?

Response: The administration would consider sharing plans for important communications with a small group of Faculty Senate members, ideally the FSEC for consistency, if it can commit to keeping those matters confidential. After conferring with FSEC we recently shared a draft of the September 30 communication regarding a reduction-in-force with the chairs of two Senate committees in confidence, and their feedback was largely incorporated. Please note there may be times when circumstances will not permit this consultation.

2. 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?

Response: If the Administration requests an agenda item for the Senate or the FSEC, we will provide any pre-reads in a timely manner in coordination with the Senate office. We will also consider whether there is additional material that can be circulated in advance to facilitate thoughtful discussions.

3. 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.

Response: We have reviewed Resolution 25/2 and believe that the new policy process articulated by the Administration addresses many of the concerns in the resolving clauses. The process provides for pre-notification of a policy proposal to the Faculty Senate, the Student Government Association, and the Staff Council prior to public posting. The Senate will have at least 40 days to review a policy proposal, including the pre-notification period, the public comment period, and the additional time to review and respond to our summary of feedback we receive on a proposal. We appreciate the concern raised about representations about when the Senate has been consulted on particular policy matters. However, assuming the policy process is followed, we believe that does constitute consultation, and we further wish to confirm we agree with you that consultation does not require agreement.

Compensation:

4. 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?

Response: According to records provided by HR, the university's complement of vice presidents and vice provosts is 20 today compared to 17 in 2021. Over that time, some positions have been created, some have been reorganized, and some have been eliminated. Some examples of changes over time:

- In 2022 the assistant provost for graduate support and fellows was upgraded to a vice provost after feedback from faculty that the position needed to be elevated given the size of our graduate student population.
- Following a departure in 2023, the position of executive vice president and chief administrative officer was eliminated.
- Following a departure in 2022, the role of Board Secretary was separated from the Chief of Staff and the responsibility for strategic initiatives was added in 2024.

Our ratio of total enrolled students per senior administrator is substantially leaner than the average of our market basket group including 8 urban, private AAU universities. Significant leadership positions lacking at GW include a dedicated treasurer and a chief investment officer, and we are severely under-resourced in external relations, including government and corporate relations. Each of these gaps poses substantial opportunity loss for GW, including leaving revenue on the table that could be supporting our academic mission.

Regarding salaries, they are determined by a multitude of factors, including market benchmarks, and the experience and qualifications that an individual brings to the job.

5. How have decisions been made to compensate administrators who have stepped down from their positions, and will those practices continue?

Response: These positions are at will and it is not uncommon for there to be changes made during times of transition. As such, it is standard practice across higher education for the contracts of senior administrators to include a provision for a severance payment. Without the protection of such a provision, it would be difficult to recruit the best possible individuals to these important roles.

6. What are the exceptions to the current hiring freeze? Other than the Provost search, what other searches are ongoing?

Response: Exceptions to the hiring freeze have been limited. For staff, we consider exceptions that are part of a strategic reorganization that reduces overall compensation costs, critical hires that support the student experience, including campus safety, that increase revenue, or that have a critical timing issue. We have also continued to authorize a limited number of faculty searches, especially for endowed or budget-neutral positions, critical backfills, or to meet urgent programmatic needs.

Please note that in our September 30 announcement regarding a reduction-in-force, we announced that the hiring freeze is reverting back to the former position management review process we used last spring, effective October 13, 2025. Like universities across the country, we are keeping a careful eye on our finances as we navigate the unpredictable environment for higher education, and the position management review process will allow us to continue managing our compensation expenses while also allowing a limited number of positions to be filled.

Layoffs:

7. 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?

Response: Decisions to reduce the number of faculty positions are rare and are never taken lightly. They are generally a last resort driven by financial pressures, enrollment challenges, and/or program changes and are only made after other options are explored (e.g., revenue enhancements, non-compensation cost reduction, etc.). Any impacts on academic programs are carefully considered before final position elimination decisions are made, including opportunities for program reorganization or restructuring, consideration of which involves significant collaboration among university, school, and departmental academic leaders and faculty.

8. 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.)?

Response: Per the Faculty Code, for non-tenured faculty appointments, notification of possible faculty non-renewal must be made a year in advance, and notified faculty typically continue to receive full salary and benefits until the end of their contract. Any support beyond the contract

term is determined by the circumstances of the separation, the terms of the faculty contract, and any applicable law. For example, the University currently pays for one month of the medical and prescription COBRA premium if the faculty member elects COBRA continuation. If applicable, tuition remission benefits are covered for the faculty member and/or their dependents for the remainder of any semester in which the faculty member departs.

Were there to be a reduction in faculty positions with programmatic implications, deans would collaborate with department and program heads and other school leaders to support remaining faculty and students and ensure program quality.

Budget/Enrollment:

9. 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.

Response: We are seeing declines in our graduate enrollments, especially in international and part-time students. These changes represent about a 6% year-over-year 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. The international graduate student decline most heavily impacts enrollments in SEAS, GWSB, and data science related programs. The part-time graduate student decline most heavily impacts enrollments in GSEHD and GWSPH, but other graduate programs are reporting fewer part-time graduate enrollees this fall. Initial estimates indicate that declines of these levels could reduce the overall graduate net tuition revenue levels by about \$10 million - exact impacts will be known in December. The administration's public reports typically only provide university-level data of this type, but further questions about enrollment impacts on individual schools, departments, and programs can be addressed by the relevant deans, department chairs, and program directors.

10. The impact of the OBBB (HR1) on budget planning and access to student funding.

Response: The federal regulations detailing the OBBB (HR1) changes to the student loan system have not been released, so it is not possible to accurately estimate effects on the university's budget or on students' access to federal loan funding. No timeline has been provided for when this information will be made available. Once we have more information, we will share this information with the Faculty Senate.

This summer, the Provost charged Vice Provost for Enrollment Management and Student Success Jay Goff with convening a working group of GW financial aid experts to examine potential strategies. Based on what has been outlined in the HR1 legislation, a significant portion of the current graduate student loan volume will shift from the federal system to private lending markets. This group has been meeting since August and are preparing a set of student loan support options that may include: (1) partnering with private lenders in ways that support affordability and transparency, (2) ensuring students have access to strong loan services and financial counseling, and (3) minimizing disruptions to students' ability to finance their education.

11. 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?

Response: Three principles are helpful to answering this question. First, degree programs should be housed in the unit that is best positioned to serve the education needs of the students. This is most often going to be schools/colleges and departments, although there can be times when a highly interdisciplinary program can be more easily administered through an institute. Second, faculty must maintain oversight of all academic programs, including programs run out of institutes. Third, a program's revenue should generally flow to cover the costs of developing and running the program, wherever those costs are incurred, and programs should not be developed with the goal of shifting revenue from one unit to another. As such, institutes should primarily focus on creating programs that generate additive revenue for the university, and revenue generated by any institute-run program must offset any costs the schools/colleges incur in supporting that program.

The new budget model is being designed with these principles in mind and seeks to enable faculty, programs, departments, and schools to work together to develop innovative and impactful educational and research programs by ensuring that: (1) revenues and costs are allocated appropriately and (2) faculty retain oversight of the programs. As such, new interdisciplinary programs - including any that might be developed by institutes - will remain connected to and include revenue sharing with the schools/colleges of participating faculty and students, thereby enabling faculty to focus on program innovations and program structures that best support our students and advance our mission.

12. 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.

Response: The percentage of cuts occurring in the central administration is considerably larger than within the schools. This has allowed for the overall school margin targets to remain generally flat to a very slight increase in FY26 from FY25. As discussed during the August 12th Faculty Senate meeting, the consolidated operating margin coming from the schools in support of the overall university margin has declined over the past several years.

CC: Bruno Fernandes, Executive Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer
Scott Mory, Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff
Emily Hammond, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs