



Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Research Committee Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate Research Committee Meeting

September 12, 2025, 12noon

In-person preferred: Science and Engineering Hall Conference Room 2000

Zoom option: Link in the Cal invite

ATTENDANCE

Present: Kay, Matthew (Chair); McDonnell, Karen (Chair); Warren, John (FSEC Liaison); Abate, Laura; Cohen-Cole, Jamie; Crandall, Keith; Downie, Evangeline; El-Ghazawi, Tarek; Freund, Maxine; Gomberg-Maitland, Mardi; Hall, Alison; Hernandez, Patricia; Mores, Christopher; Kimmel, Anna Jayne; Liu, Cindy; Lohr, Gina; Magnus, Many; Mallinson, Trudy; Mendelowitz, David; Miller, Robert; Pintz, Christine; Subramaniam, Suresh; Yeung, Ellen;

Absent: Applebaum, Kate; Artino, Anthony; Bosque-Pardos, Alberto; Bukrinsky, Michael; Colby, Thomas; Cornwell, Graham; Dowling, Maritza; Engel, Laura; Entcheva, Emilia; Frechette, John; Gillis, Bill; Shirrell, Matthew; Wallington, Sherrie; Wei, Peng; Vanessa Perry; Zhang, Grace

AGENDA

- 1) Welcome and very brief member introductions (Kay & McDonnell)
- 2) Announcements (Kay & McDonnell)
 - 2a) Faculty Senate Executive Committee charge to the committee - attached (Kay)
 - 2b) Profs McDonnell & Kay will meet with Pres Granberg and Interim Provost Lach (McDonnell)
- 3) Updates from Interim Vice Provost for Research Robert Miller
 - 3a) Research Support Team status update (Miller)
 - 3b) Reminder: <https://provost.gwu.edu/announcing-enhancements-research-administration-support>
- 4) Very brief updates from each Research Support Team (Team Leaders or ADRs)
- 5) Discussion of how to use the 2024-25 FSRC Working Group reports (McDonnell & Kay)
- 6) Discussion of new/other issues that the FSRC should consider this AY (All)
- 7) Adjourn

MEETING SUMMARY

Quick recap

The Faculty Senate Research Committee held its first meeting of the 2025-2026 academic year to discuss key initiatives. The committee reviewed updates on federal funding issues, research profiles, and the development of a new misconduct policy, while also discussing the establishment of a new interdisciplinary research committee. ADRs gave brief updates on research support teams and progress on the student union implementation was discussed.

Next steps

- Karen & Matt to meet with President and Provost in October after two committee meetings
- Karen/Matt have scheduled one-on-one meetings with each research-intensive ADR
- Faculty Senate Research Committee to provide input on priorities for discussion with President and Provost
- Committee members who are interested in serving on the GW interdisciplinary initiatives committee should notify Dr. Miller by Tuesday
- Federal funding proposals will soon require research security training for all grant personnel
- Faculty to complete required research security training before October 12th NIH deadline
- OVPR is working to finalize a research misconduct policy (required by the federal government), must be GW-approved and implemented by January 1st. The FSRC could facilitate the adoption of this new policy.
- Dr. Miller to continue serving as interim VP for Research through academic year 2025-2026

Summary

Faculty Senate Research Committee Inaugural Meeting

The committee has 39 members in total, with 24 voting members representing various schools based on their size and research output. Matt and Karen emphasized that the committee's composition was carefully considered to ensure a diverse and representative group. The meeting then moved to introductions, where members briefly shared their affiliations and roles.

Research Committee Initiatives and Charges

The FSRC received the annual charge from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to engage in the search for a new Vice Provost for Research, address recommendations from previous working groups, examine graduate student funding in light of unionization, assess the status of research core facilities, and discuss ongoing challenges to research at GW.

Federal Research Funding Challenges

Dr. Miller (Bob) led a discussion on updates and challenges related to federal funding for research, particularly in the context of ongoing political and administrative changes. He highlighted that the university is bracing for a new wave of terminations of federal grants, likely driven by ideological disagreements. He emphasized the importance of collaboration between principal investigators and administrative staff to address these issues. Trudy shared specific challenges with funding from agencies like AHRQ and HRSA, noting delays and uncertainty in receiving funds. The group discussed the need to track proposals and follow up on funding opportunities amidst organizational changes at federal agencies. Bob also addressed concerns about the timing of fund disbursement by the federal government, noting that while some delays exist, efforts are being made (ie, by NIH) to release allocated funds by the end of September. Bob asked for schools to submit grant and contract expenses ASAP so that funds can be drawn down from federal sources to cover those expenses without any significant delay.

Misconduct Policy and Research Initiatives

The meeting discussed the progress and next steps for a new misconduct policy, which has undergone revisions and is set to be reviewed by the Policy Advisory Board (PAB) next week. FSRC could provide meaningful support and expert input, noting that the policy aligns with government regulations and templates. A new GW interdisciplinary research committee was formed earlier this

year and tasked with defining and promoting a thriving interdisciplinary research ecosystem. Dr. Miller invited interested faculty to submit their names for consideration by Tuesday. Committee members expressed concerns about balancing institutional priorities with individual research initiatives and emphasized the need to create an environment that encourages diverse interdisciplinary projects while maintaining support for creative independent research.

Research Security and Provost Search

The meeting focused on upcoming research security training requirements, with NIH and NSF deadlines in October for principal investigators and key personnel, including graduate students and postdocs. The committee discussed the need to identify a new provost. It was suggested that bringing in someone from an AAU institution with a larger research portfolio would be a great idea, though no immediate search is planned. The administration's primary objective is to have a permanent provost in place by the end of the academic year.

Research VP Role and Union Progress

The group discussed the need to return the research role to a vice president position, separate from the provost's office, to better manage budgets and facilitate interdisciplinary work. They also addressed the progress of the student union, noting that meetings have been cordial so far, with discussions focusing on non-controversial topics. Dr. Subramaniam mentioned that IP rights are being considered, particularly regarding copyright for instructional materials created by teaching assistants, and estimated that the union could be implemented within the next 5 years requiring a potential 15% increase toward graduate student support (sourced from research grants and TA funds).

Research Support Teams Restructuring Update

The research committee discussed organizational changes to research support teams (RSTs). Bob explained that the four RSTs are now in existence but still need leadership positions, with new manager roles being created to handle day-to-day operations and free up ADRs for school-based responsibilities. The committee heard updates from ADRs Christopher Mores (Public Health) and Alison Hall (Medicine), who reported managing at-risk awards and tracking high application volumes, while Christopher raised concerns about staffing shortages in Public Health and Law, which Alison acknowledged was also affecting her RST pending its split into two units.

Faculty Senate Research Committee Meeting Minutes

October 17, 2025, 12noon

In-person preferred: Science and Engineering Hall Conference Room 2000

Zoom option: Link in the Cal invite

ATTENDANCE

Present:

Kay, Matthew (Chair); McDonnell, Karen (Chair); Abate, Laura; Artino, Anthony; Bosque-Pardos, Alberto; Cohen-Cole, Jamie; Crandall, Keith; Downie, Evangeline; Dowling, Maritza; El-Ghazawi, Tarek; Engel, Laura; Entcheva, Emilia; Freund, Maxine; Gillis, Bill; Gomberg-Maitland, Mardi; Hall, Alison; Hernandez, Patricia; Kimmel, Anna; Mores, Christopher; Liu, Cindy; Lohr, Gina; Magnus, Manya; Mallinson, Trudy; Mendelowitz, David; Pintz, Christine; Subramaniam, Suresh; Wallington, Sherrie; Yeung, Ellen;

Absent:

Applebaum, Kate; Bukrinsky, Michael; Colby, Thomas; Cornwell, Graham; Frechette, John; Miller, Robert; Shirrell, Matthew; Wei, Peng; Vanessa Perry; Warren, John (FSEC Liaison); Zhang, Grace;

AGENDA

- 1) Approval of Sept meeting minutes & announcements (McDonnell & Kay)
- 2) FSRC Chairs meeting with Granberg and Lach on Oct 23 (McDonnell & Kay)
- 3) Draft policy on allegation of research misconduct (Lohr, Okeefe, Hammatt)
- 4) Discussion on recognizing doctoral student research at the annual faculty awards ceremony (Subramaniam)
- 5) Discussion of wanting to know how the new budget model will affect research at GW (McDonnell).
- 6) Discussion of how anticipated changes in the administrative and financial structure of the MFA could impact research (Magnus).

If time allows....

- 7) Discussion of how to use the 2024-25 FSRC Working Group reports (McDonnell & Kay)
- 8) Very brief updates from each Research Support Team (Team Leaders or ADRs)
- 9) Discussion of new/other issues that the FSRC should consider this AY (All)
- 10) Adjourn

MEETING SUMMARY

Quick recap

The meeting focused on reviewing and refining a draft document/presentation for the President and provost, which highlighted key themes from ADR interviews and surveys. The group discussed elevating the Office of the Vice Provost for Research to higher administrative levels and addressed concerns about research support, funding, and faculty resources. The conversation ended with

discussions about updating the research misconduct policy, establishing a doctoral dissertation award program, exploring software licensing options, and addressing financial structures related to research institutions.

Next steps

- Gina and Kelly to develop SOPs for research misconduct proceedings after policy approval
- Suresh to create a detailed proposal for the GW Outstanding Dissertation Award, including eligibility criteria, timeline, and review process
- Suresh to share the detailed proposal with the research committee for discussion
- Faculty to provide feedback on the research misconduct policy through the public comment portal or to Gina and Kelly directly
- Research committee to consider providing a statement of support for the research misconduct policy

Summary

Key Themes for President Meeting

The meeting began with a discussion about technical issues and agenda review. Karen presented the latest draft for a meeting with the President and Provost, highlighting themes from interviews and surveys. The group narrowed down initial themes to five key areas. Karen noted a high response rate from voting committee members and sought feedback on the draft before the upcoming meeting.

Enhancing OVPR's Administrative Standing

The group discussed elevating the Office of the Vice Provost for Research (OVPR) to the highest administrative levels at GW, as it is currently embedded within too many substructures. They emphasized the need for interdisciplinary collaboration, institutional alignment, faculty incubation and innovation, leveraging AAU membership, and improving funding, facilities, and research support. The faculty survey results highlighted leadership, communication, transparency, and investments in research as key priorities, along with the need to strengthen the culture of collaboration and innovation, establish research clusters, and improve post-award support. The group also discussed the feasibility and priority of various actions, including enhancing internal funding mechanisms, decentralizing research support, with some expressing concerns about the current state of their departments and the need for adequate resources to retain AAU status.

Research Misconduct Policy Updates

The meeting focused on discussing updates to the research misconduct policy and its implementation at George Washington University. Kelly explained the changes to the inquiry and investigation timeframes, emphasizing that the policy now explicitly applies to all research regardless of sponsor. The group discussed concerns about the potential misuse of research misconduct allegations in political contexts, with Kelly assuring that the policy focuses strictly on fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism. They also addressed the process for handling complaints, including a pre-assessment step to determine if the allegations meet the definition of research misconduct. The committee was encouraged to provide feedback on the policy before the November deadline, with any support from the committee being particularly valuable for moving the policy forward.

GW Dissertation Award Proposal Discussion

The group discussed creating a GW Outstanding Dissertation Award to recognize student research, with Suresh proposing four categories aligned with NAGS. While the idea was generally supported, concerns were raised about timing, eligibility criteria, and potential competition between students.

The group suggested considering a separate ceremony for student awards and explored ideas like linking awards to Research Day or Innovation Fest. Suresh agreed to develop a more detailed proposal for next year's consideration, acknowledging the need to address logistical challenges and align with existing school-level awards. The group discussed potentially pushing nominations to January or February, with Suresh expressing optimism about completing the process quickly. They agreed to start reviewing guidelines and requirements for the nominations, with Suresh taking the lead on preparing an initial document.

Software Licensing

The conversation then shifted to software licensing, where Suresh proposed exploring an institutional license for Overleaf, an online LaTeX editor, and Alison and Matt suggested considering BioRender.

Budget discussion

Concerns about the lack of transparency regarding the new budget model's impact on research institutions were raised, noting that only a few individuals have seen the model and that a subcommittee is currently reviewing it. The group discussed concerns about the financial structure of the MFA and its implications for research and education following a potential UHS purchase. They explored various models for conducting research, including partnerships with industry and the NIH, while acknowledging uncertainty about the hospital's commitment to supporting research and education. The discussion highlighted the need to establish clear agreements between the university and hospital regarding research responsibilities, with suggestions made to create a separate clinical public health medicine research institute. Committee members mentioned that OGC is raising research issues at the negotiation table, though details are still being worked out.

**THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY**

WASHINGTON, DC

Faculty Senate Committee on Research

Report to the President and Provost

10/23/2025

Prepared by co-Chairs: Karen A McDonnell, PhD (GWSPH) and Matthew W Kay, PE DSc (SEAS)

Renovate to Innovate

The FSCR Co-Chairs interviewed 6 ADR's and surveyed all voting members of the committee. We present the findings of the qualitative remarks and the quantitative survey items.

Areas for GW Leadership to Invest to Enhance Research Enterprise and Promise

Presented in descending order. Response Scale 0=not at all important to 100 = extremely important (n=17/24)

Areas for GW Leadership to Address	Average score (0-100)	Median Score
1. GW Leadership plans for improving and investing in the research enterprise	93	100
2. Information on how the new budget model will affect research	82	88
3. Post award processing and support	74	80
4. Research service support: Support in developing large scale grant proposals	74	80
5. Providing internal funding mechanisms	73	82
6. Student support for research	73	81
7. The ability to collaborate among schools at GW	68	80
8. Pre-award processing	66	76
9. Research service support: Financial support to publish in open access journals	65	73
10. Regulatory and oversight systems	55	50
11. Finding external funding opportunities	48	42

This table presents faculty recommendations organized by two dimensions: Feasibility and Impact. Each recommendation is listed with its respective priority level in both categories.

Recommendation	Feasibility Priority	Impact Priority
Strengthen Institutional Commitment to Research (greater involvement of FSRC <i>Renovate to Innovate</i>)	High	High
Elevate OVPR leadership to the highest administrative levels (including Cabinet, Leadership, BOT representation, Budget)	High	High
Improve Pre- and Post-Award Support	High	High
Enhance Internal Funding Mechanisms	High	High
Fund Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty Lines	High*	High
Decentralized Research Management	Medium	High
Foster Interdisciplinary Research	Medium	High
Streamline IT Systems (collaborative)	Medium	Medium
Reform Doctoral Student Funding	Medium	Medium
Standardize Teaching Loads Across Schools	Medium	Medium
Recognize Multi-PI Contributions	Medium	Medium
Improve Access to Core Facilities	Medium	Medium
Reinvest in Promised Funds	Low	Medium
Align with Global Research Networks	Low	Medium
Leverage GW Hospital & MFA for Clinical Research	Low**	High

*Identify the 'hot spots' (enrollment, research, tenure/track faculty, mismatch) **have opportunity presently

ADR Themes: Top 5 Themes

Research Infrastructure & Administrative Reform

- **Elevate OVPR leadership to the highest administrative levels at GW.**
 - Definitions of research, sponsored projects, and fee-for-service work are unclear.
 - Financial systems (e.g., R funds vs. EAS) are fragmented and unsustainable.
 - Central services are inefficient and unresponsive.
 - IRB and institutional memory issues hinder continuity and project support.
 - Frequent administrative transitions lead to confusion and broken commitments.
 - GW IRB is overwhelmed; external consultants could help but funding is unclear.
-

Interdisciplinary Collaboration & Institutional Alignment

- **Silos between schools and units hinder joint research efforts.**
 - Provost-run institutes lack transparency and overlap with school-based centers.
 - Difficulty in sharing credit, indirect costs, and co-mentoring trainees.
 - Barriers to joint faculty hires and cross-school grant submissions.
 - Need for a unified “OneGW” approach to research.
-

Faculty Incubation & Innovation

- **Invest in existing faculty, especially mid-career and senior researchers.**
 - Create innovation awards to help faculty pivot and explore new funding.
 - Shift from punitive to supportive models of research productivity.
 - Encourage esprit de corps and cross-rank engagement in research.
-

Strategic Vision & AAU Leverage

- Use AAU membership to elevate GW’s research reputation.
 - Recruit leadership from AAU institutions.
 - Develop metrics that include trainee involvement and doctoral program impact.
 - Align school-level research visions and report progress annually.
-

Funding, Facilities & Research Support-Sustainability

- Concerns about NIH funding and need for diversified sources (philanthropy, industry).
- Challenges in setting up PhD support packages and recruiting domestic students.
- Underutilized facilities like GW NIC need strategic planning.
- RST staff are stretched thin; need better retention and proposal support.
- Proposal development could benefit from design and formatting expertise.

Faculty Responses: Top 5 Thematic Areas of Research Enhancement Importance

Strategic Vision & External Engagement

- **Leadership & Communication:** Need clearer communication, transparency, and visible commitment from GW leadership to research. FSRC needs to be at the table, especially during budget meetings.
 - **Invest in existing faculty, especially mid-career and senior researchers.** There will be a strong return on this investment, especially in helping faculty/researchers to pivot into fundable research areas.
 - **Global Networks:** Joining international research consortia like U21 to expand collaboration and diversify funding.
 - **Clinical Research Integration:** GW's hospital and MFA are underutilized assets for clinical research.
-

Strengthen Culture of Collaboration and Innovation

- **Establish centralized research clusters** and formal spaces for collaboration.
 - **Interdisciplinary Collaboration:** Barriers to cross-school collaboration are a major issue. Faculty want streamlined processes for interdisciplinary work.
 - **Recognition in Multi-PI Projects:** Calls for equitable recognition and access for all PIs in multi-PI grants, based on pre-submission agreements.
 - **Research Culture:** Culture of inquiry beyond revenue-driven metrics, including more informal venues for sharing work-in-progress.
-

Research Infrastructure & Administrative Efficiency

- **Streamline** pre- and post-award processes, hiring, and contract setup. Reduce duplication of efforts across research offices.
 - **Modern IT Systems:** Need for integrated, user-friendly systems to support research activities.
 - **Streamlined Hiring & Contracts:** Frustration with slow personnel hiring and contract setup processes.
 - **Post-Award Support:** Inefficiencies in RSTs, OSP, and HR, with calls for more staff and better support.
 - **Decentralized Support:** Criticisms of the POD structure; preference for placing research support staff within individual schools.
-

Expand Funding and Resource Support

- **Increase funding** for research activities, book publication costs, and interdisciplinary projects.
 - **Develop diversified funding** sources and strategies to manage government funding disruptions.
 - **Student & Trainee Support:** Strong emphasis on funding doctoral students and postdocs, including removing tuition charges for STEM PhDs and incentivizing faculty mentorship.
 - **Internal Funding Mechanisms:** Faculty request more frequent and higher-value internal grants, pilot funding, and support for open-access publication fees. Prioritize investing in existing faculty, especially mid-career and senior researchers.
 - **Indirect Recovery & Creative Funding:** Suggestions to use indirect cost recovery and other creative means to support pilot data generation and publication.
-

Promote Faculty Equity and Capacity

- **Standardize Teaching/Service Expectations to Enhance Equity:** Disparities in teaching loads across schools are seen as barriers to research productivity. Standardizing non-research labor and offering buyouts would promote equity.
 - **Tenure-Track Faculty Lines:** Release tenure-track positions that have been approved
 - **Centralized Research Clusters:** Faculty advocate for formalized interdisciplinary centers or clusters to foster collaboration and amplify research visibility.
-