



Faculty Senate

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SENATE MEETING
HELD ON FEBRUARY 13, 2026
HYBRID: 1957 E ST NW/STATE ROOM & ZOOM**

Present: President Granberg; Interim Provost Lach; Parliamentarian Binder; Registrar Cloud; Senate Office Staff Liz Carlson and Jenna Chaojareon; Deans Ayres, Bass, Henry, Kelly-Weeder, Matthew, Riddle, Wahlbeck, and Yeltekin; Interim Deans Howard and Zara; Professors Akman, Badie, Belenky, Bignami, Borum, Briggs, Brinkerhoff, Callier, Cohen-Cole, Core, Crandall, Cseh, Eakle, El-Ghazawi, Engel, Fagan, Feldman, Gore, Hernandez, Kay, Kulp, Liu, Markus, McAlister, Mendelowitz, Merluzzi, Mylonas, Orti, Rain, Rigg, Sarkar, Schultheiss, Trangsrud, Vyas, Warren, Wilson, and Wirtz.

Absent: Dean Gebo; Professors Bamford, Cheh, Kieff, and White.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:03p.m. President Granberg welcomed the group back to the renovated State Room. She also welcomed Professor Francesca Bignami of the Law School to the Senate; Professor Bignami was elected to temporarily fill Professor Cottrol's seat while he is on sabbatical.

MINUTES APPROVAL

The minutes of the January 16, 2026, Senate meeting were approved without objection.

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

The [President's report](#) and [Interim Provost's report](#) were provided with the posted agenda for today's meeting.

President Granberg offered the following additional remarks:

Good afternoon. You'll see the topics from Interim Provost Lach's and my pre-reads on the screen. I have just a few additional items to add to my report this afternoon.

First, welcome to our freshly renovated space here at 1957 E Street. My thanks to Baxter Goodly and his team for their great work on this project. I'd encourage you to take a look at the artwork as well, which is from GW's collection and really adds a nice finishing touch.

This has been a quintessential GW week, reminding me that even with the challenges we face, the university continues to make great progress and provide a wonderful experience for our students, faculty, and staff. We started the week celebrating Charter Day, and on Tuesday, we welcomed Buddhist monks during their Walk for Peace. We also hosted the international conference *Challenging Extremism, Antisemitism, and Hate*, which included many prominent speakers, including Assistant Attorney General Harmeet Dhillon.

That evening, we honored the academic achievements of our student-athletes and named the faculty member of the year (elected by the student-athletes) at the men's basketball game against Rhode Island, which we won.

At the same time, GW College Republicans welcomed Texas Congressman Brandon Gill, who spoke about his work in Congress, the future of the Republican party, and the new Trump Administration. Congressman Gil had been scheduled to talk to the group the night Charlie Kirk was assassinated, and we were gratified to support them in bringing him back. Tuesday was a busy day!

On Wednesday, the university convened the 2026 Campus Compact Presidents' Policy and Impact Summit and hosted a meditation service with the monks at the Smith Center. The facility was completely full, with hundreds of others standing outside. What a week at GW!

Provost Search

The search committee has completed their evaluation of the semi-finalists and has turned over to me a list of finalists. We had a wonderful meeting earlier this week, and I want to relay that the search committee did an absolutely outstanding job. This, as it turns out, was one of the most attractive jobs, and we had an amazing pool of candidates. It was very hard to narrow that down, but the search committee did a magnificent job. The next step will be a round of on-campus visits. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be interviewing each of the finalists, and we'll get really good input from that group, as well as others. I anticipate that we'll wrap this up by the end of March and will hopefully be able to make an announcement in late March or early April.

Personal Recognition of Barbara Bass

I would like to note that this is Dean Barbara Bass's last Faculty Senate meeting before her retirement at the end of this month. Interim Provost Lach will be sharing notes of recognition, but I would like to offer my own personal reflections on the three years I have had the privilege to work with Barbara.

The role of Dean of the GW School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) as well as Vice President for Health Affairs is incredibly demanding, applying pressure from multiple directions, including and especially at a time when the university has been working to manage complex negotiations that so deeply affect our community.

Barbara, to these demands, you have brought steady leadership, clarity, and remarkable grace. You made difficult decisions always considering what is best for the institution and for the community, remaining focused on what matters most: our students, our faculty, our staff, the patients our faculty

care for, and the integrity of our mission. Even as you have led, you have created space for those around you to grow and thrive. On a personal note, Barbara, I am grateful for your counsel and your partnership and friendship. I have valued your honesty, your perspective, and your steady presence more than I can say. On behalf of the entire university community: thank you. We are better because you were here.

Dr. Lach offered the following additional remarks:

Recognition of Dean Barbara Lee Bass

As President Granberg mentioned in her comments, Dean Barbara Bass's tenure as vice president for health affairs, dean of the GW School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Walter A. Bloedorn Chair of Administrative Medicine and professor of surgery, will end at the end of this month. Dean Bass has had two careers at GW, first training as a general surgeon from 1979 to 1986 and then returning in January 2020 to become the first woman to serve as vice president for health affairs and dean of SMHS.

Here are just a few highlights from her six years leading GW's health affairs:

- Dean Bass bolstered the academic medical enterprise through recruitment and retention of renowned academic leadership, the installation of 17 endowed professorships and chairs, and partnering with University Advancement to raise more than \$80 million for SMHS, including 17 principal gifts of \$1 million or more.
- In 2020, Dean Bass launched a strategic planning process that resulted in SMHS's 2023-2026 Strategic Plan, defined by four pillars of education, research, clinical care, and population health and health equity.
- Research expenditures across a variety of critical topics, including cancer biology and neuroscience, increased by 50% over five years during Dean Bass's tenure. In just one example, SMHS acquired its first NIH T32 training awards for the GW Cancer Biology Training Program and HIV/AIDS research training initiatives. To continue supporting careers in research, her team also established the Office of Clinical Research to provide pre-and post-submission support for faculty pursuing clinical and translational research.
- SMHS opened the Center for Population Health and Health Equity and expanded the GW Cancer Center during Dean Bass's time as dean.
- And we cannot forget how Dean Bass helped lead the university through the COVID-19 crisis, helping to coordinate the emergency response across SMHS operations and enabling SMHS and the MFA to manage university-wide testing programs.

Dean Bass leaves SMHS in a position of great strength, and we are deeply grateful for her service to the academic medical community. On a personal note, I am especially lucky to have served alongside her in two roles as a fellow dean and as interim provost. And I wish her all the best for the future, which I understand includes caring for her bees. Thank you, Barbara.

2026 AAAS Annual Meeting in Phoenix

For the third year, GW is sponsoring the 2026 AAAS Annual Meeting, which is taking place in Phoenix as we speak. The meeting attracts more than 4,000 science and research stakeholders. Working together, the Office of the Vice President for Research and the Office of Communications and Marketing have coordinated a strong slate of programming and activity to elevate GW's research

profile. Highlights include a Sci-Mic Stage session featuring Professors Roy Richard Grinker, Gabriela Rosenblau, and Holden Thorp on "Reclaiming Science in the Neurodiversity Debate;" interactive demos at the GW Booth showcasing Arty, the emotion-sensing robot dog, and hands-on art therapy activities; and a journalist roundtable with Professor Grinker on destigmatizing neurodiverse conditions.

Recent Events

Finally, a few brief updates on several events I have had the pleasure of participating in recently that celebrate excellence across our community.

- On February 3, I attended a lunch for the College of Professional Studies and Cyber Guild's Cybersecurity, Stronger Together Conference, which is an annual event that convenes leaders, experts and innovators in cybersecurity. This year's theme was Converging Threats, Shared Defenses and served as a catalyst for action to strengthen our infrastructure.
- Later that evening, I hosted another Pizza with the Provost alongside Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students Colette Coleman, discussing myriad topics with our students ranging from class waitlist questions to the recent weather challenges. My data so far is that not many students know what a Provost is, so the event's new tagline is: "Come for the pizza, stay for the Provost."
- Last Thursday, GW Law hosted the final round of the 76th annual Van Vleck Constitutional Law Moot Court Competition, our largest and longest-running upper-level advocacy competition. Four members of the GW Law class of 2026 stood for the petitioners and the respondents, and among the three judges was Chief Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court of the United States - truly an "Only at GW" event.
- Speaking of "Only at GW," as President Granberg mentioned, we were thrilled to host the monks from the Walk for Peace on campus as they reached the final stop on their over 2,000 mile long journey here in Washington, D.C. On Wednesday evening, we hosted a special livestreamed program of peace and meditation in the Smith Center, and I think I finally found my meditation groove.

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

Professor Vyas echoed the President's and Provost's sentiments about hosting the Walk for Peace monks, observing that the event was a powerful reminder of the importance of love and kindness. In that spirit, she asked about the ongoing University Health Services (UHS) negotiations. Recognizing that details are not available publicly yet, but, given the Strategic Framework and the importance of research to GW's future, she noted that there is a great deal of concern among investigators and trainees at GW about the future of research and the ability to engage meaningfully with patient populations to conduct clinical research. She asked how investigators should be thinking about this.

President Granberg, confirming that there is not a lot she can say at the present moment about the UHS negotiations, relayed that there is an active conversation with UHS about what the clinical research picture might look like there. She also expected that GW would expand the number of sites where GW faculty can do research, noting that she would be asking Interim Dean Artenstein to work with faculty to identify other

sites that would be appealing for SMHS and GW clinical research. She stated her intent to maintain health and clinical research, noting that there would be an evolution in this area as sites beyond the hospital form agreements for this type of work.

Professor Feldman raised a concern about the recent pausing of some doctoral admissions, noting that this is connected to the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (CCAS) but has consequences beyond that school. She recognized that the university needs to make difficult choices in difficult times; she also recalled discussions about the importance of making difficult decisions well and thoughtfully and with the least amount of harm to the educational mission. She expressed concern about how the process unfolded in this case, noting that, in her department, the decision to halt admissions happened after the applications deadline, and applicants were not informed of the change in a timely manner. She noted that this could result in a reputational cost to the department and the university. She added that previous discussions have emphasized the need to avoid making cuts with blunt instruments, which don't account for specific consequences. She asked what GW plans to do to support the strength and continuance of doctoral education at the university during these uncertain times.

Dr. Lach affirmed that PhD students are part of the lifeblood of the academic enterprise. The difficult decisions about halting admissions in some doctoral programs were made based on a variety of factors, including market pressure and the anticipated rising cost of each PhD student. He agreed that making these decisions carefully and with great consideration is very important. He noted that Dean Wahlbeck has convened a group of faculty to look at doctoral education across CCAS and provide recommendations about supporting doctoral programs and research in a sustainable way.

Professor Brinkerhoff observed that everyone clearly remains concerned about how difficult decisions will be made going forward and about sustaining the university's mission and core strengths. She noted that it is very important to make it as easy as possible for people to do what you want them to do and that presenting specific requests would help in this endeavor. In that spirit, she asked that the administration identify and make known what criteria will be used as the basis for decisions about the restructuring or elimination of programs or units and the layoffs of faculty or staff. This information would help the community understand these decisions and be more willing to accept them. Doing so will also retain trust and help the administration keep the faith of the faculty.

She next requested that the President and Provost facilitate a discussion among the deans about the tradeoffs made across the schools. Reiterating her concern about GW's decentralized model, she noted that this decentralization results in an inability to understand how units can build on each other's strengths and compensate for each other's weaknesses. This also concerns how cuts and expenses should be implemented. Why should one unit be faced with cutting a wholesale program to subsidize a unit that still provides faculty travel support and research funding? It is the President and the Provost's responsibility to help all unit leaders to see the big picture of the needs of the university.

Finally, she noted that the whole community is living in a time of incredible uncertainty, which creates more stress. She asked that the leadership eliminate some of this uncertainty by communicating concrete information about the new budget model, and specifically when it will become operational.

President Granberg thanked Professor Brinkerhoff for her well-stated points, adding that she took notes of them for follow-up. Dr. Lach agreed and looked forward to the planned discussion later in the meeting of the budget model.

Professor Wirtz referenced yesterday's [GW Today story about the 2001 Pennsylvania Avenue project](#). In light of the discussion of concerns about budget strains creating an impasse in terms of achieving some institutional goals, he wondered whether a proposal to move wholesale parts of the organization from one site to another is a wise way to spend the university's limited resources when doctoral programs are being cut and staff are being laid off. President Granberg responded that there are two needs costing the university money in this area: a lack of swing space that would permit renovations to areas of campus that are not functioning well, and an enormous number of groups in leased space GW is paying about \$11 million annually to use. She shared her philosophy that academics and student life should sit at the core of campus, with administration at the perimeter. The buildings under discussion—1918 and 1922 F Street—would be repurposed to provide swing space during renovations and then ultimately become home to academic programs, allowing the university to exit very expensive lease agreements while also providing swing space for other campus space renovations. This is a very long-term project, and she understood the question about resources given the present climate, while noting that the administration opted not to keep this project a secret until after the current budget situation has been resolved.

Professor Wirtz followed up, noting that he participated in a very productive discussion with the group working on the renewal of the campus plan. In looking at those plans and in considering the amount of money required to realize them, he asked whether it makes sense to put this ahead of priorities such as doctoral students. President Granberg responded that she felt it was a false equivalence to say that this plan is being placed ahead of academic priorities. She noted first that nothing about these renovations pulls on operating funds, instead coming exclusively from capital funds. Second, to obtain the benefits of swing space, renovations are required. It is conceivable, she added, that if the budget situation gets tight enough the project would be delayed, but, given the need for the space, she did not want to stop now on a maybe. The university will not be profligate about this, but there are real and needed benefits from this project.

Professor El-Ghazawi noted that, in the School of Engineering and Applied Science (SEAS) faculty meeting today, there were many questions reflecting anxiety around budget cuts, particularly on the 5%/10%/15% contingency planning efforts. He asked whether this scenario planning is limited to the schools. The President responded that every single division at the university is engaged in this planning exercise.

Professor Wilson noted that [a recent Hatchet story](#) went into detail about the university's relationship with the Cedar Hill hospital being in jeopardy as result of the UHS negotiations, and he asked if the President could expand on this. President Granberg responded that, while she could not comment in detail at present, she confirmed that Cedar Hill is a piece of the discussion and that she would share more information when a comprehensive agreement is reached. She noted that there is currently an independent agreement for GW to provide physicians to Cedar Hill for UHS. That agreement may not change at all, but, should it be amended, any new agreement could be folded into the new GW-UHS agreement. She added that GW's only responsibility at Cedar Hill is to provide physicians; everything else about the center is UHS's responsibility. UHS has a contract with the District for Cedar Hill; GW's contract is with UHS.

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (FSEC Chair)

The [Faculty Senate Executive Committee \(FSEC\)](#) report was circulated with the agenda of today's meeting. Professor Orti noted that the [2026-2027 Senate standing committee service call](#) is now open; he encouraged faculty to volunteer.

In addition, he noted, the Disability policy, specifically the accompanying Disability Policy Grievance Procedure, is under revision in the office of Equal Employment Opportunity & Access. The details and avenue for feedback are as follows:

Equal Employment Opportunity & Access (EEOA) within Human Resource Management & Development, in conjunction with Disability Support Services (DSS), is in the process of making revisions to the university's [Disability Policy](#), and more specifically, the accompanying [Disability Policy Grievance Procedure](#), newly named the Disability Accommodation Review and Appeal Procedure. The Faculty Senate (specifically the EPT and PEAFF committees) has been identified as a key stakeholder of the policy. Therefore, we are seeking broad-level input and consultation on our work thus far, consistent with the drafting phase of the Guidelines for University Policy Review Process.

A summary of the edits to the policy and procedure are below:

- Updates to the accompanying process, “Disability Accommodation Review and Appeal Procedure,” were made to streamline the process but keep the spirit the same. The revisions:
 - Change “Grievance” to “Appeal” throughout.
 - Clarify that “initial reviews” of the decision being appealed should be done by either the AVP of EEOA or Director of DSS (depending on the requestor’s role at GW). If those individuals were the original decision-makers, individuals may bypass this informal resolution step to submit an appeal directly under the process.
 - Create a central pathway for appeals to be submitted and reviewed, improving consistency.
 - Clarify who will be involved in the review and decision-making process.
 - Establish clear criteria used to evaluate a submitted appeal, aligned with current operational practice.
 - Articulate that if an individual involved in the decision-making is identified as having a conflict of interest, a designee will be assigned from the Accessibility Committee.
- Similar changes were made to the policy to provide community members with clear and up-to-date information, along with general wordsmithing edits.

Any feedback, questions, or concerns related to the policy may be emailed to accommodations@gwu.edu.

BRIEF STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS/FSEC REPORT

None.

[RESOLUTION 26/5](#): To Extend Certain Approved Temporary Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity (Jamie Cohen-Cole, Co-Chair, Educational Policy & Technology Committee)

Professor Cohen-Cole requested and obtained the Senate’s consent for Professor Thomas Choate, co-chair of the Educational Policy & Technology committee (EPT) to introduce the resolution. Professor Choate referenced the [attached slides](#) in his introduction.

Professor Feldman stated it is clear the Senate needs to adopt this resolution but asked two questions:

- 1) If the university is now three years into adopting a temporary condition, has the time come to consider what the permanent condition should be?
- 2) Given that there is still an issue with the timely resolution of cases, what has not been addressed in the temporary changes that will help get cases to completion?

Professor Choate responded that more faculty volunteers are needed if the goal is to continue using panels. Given last year's volunteer numbers, he was optimistic that this is possible. He added that EPT, the Provost, the Student Government Association, and Conflict Education and Student Accountability (CESA) need to consider broader reforms to the Code of Academic Integrity, but these are not ready for presentation yet. He noted that case numbers have stabilized; if that stabilization holds, that will be evidence of the "new normal" to which the Code should be adjusted.

Professor McAlister asked what drove the increase in cases two years ago. Professor Choate responded that the increase was coincident with the major popular roll-out of large language models (LLMs). A fair number of reports were coming from and still come from courses and departments where LLMs tend to be highly effective at facilitating academic dishonesty.

Professor Schultheiss asked whether any thought has been given to trying to simplify and shorten the required panelist training, noting that multiple days and hours of training is a barrier to entry. Professor Choate responded that CESA has made efforts to make as much of the training as possible asynchronous, leaving two synchronous sessions, and CESA has assured EPT that other steps can be taken. Part of the reason for the length of the training at present is that faculty panelists have to be trained to serve on both student conduct panels and on academic integrity panels; there are essentially two training modules that have to be completed. There is a proposed revision to the Student Code of Conduct, which would remove student conduct panels; if that revision were to be adopted, that would essentially halve the training.

Professor Wilson noted that he thought he had volunteered but did not hear anything about training. Professor Choate responded that he would follow up with CESA about their process.

The resolution was adopted by unanimous consent.

REPORT: Faculty Salary Equity Review (Emily Hammond, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs)

Interim Vice Provost Hammond shared a [pre-read of their report](#) to the Senate and reviewed that report before turning to questions. They relayed that the deans are allocated 0.5% of their faculty salaries to use for equity adjustments, noting that this allocation is not just for equity adjustments. It is also for retention and promotion increases; so, although this is covered by the central budget in the first year, going forward, the deans cover this cost in their own budgets. This is therefore something that is very sensitive to the budgetary environment, and deans are looking not only at the individual faculty member but also at their overall budgetary landscape when they are making these decisions. They added that another thing to consider is that a dean will often look at equity adjustments for a faculty member over a period longer than one year in order to work within their budget constraints.

Professor Wilson asked why there are big differences in the number of equity adjustments across the schools and whether the lack of merit increases last year is a factor. Vice Provost Hammond responded that, in years with merit, there tends to be more movement in the adjustment results. They noted that they did not want to speak for the deans, who have discretion over the adjustments, but noted that each dean needs

to look at their budget and the individual information about each outlier. In some cases, deans may want to look at the numbers over the longer term if an individual is at the margin, taking the next annual reporting cycle into account. Dean Wahlbeck added that, in large part, CCAS has more outliers because they have more faculty, noting that he could not speak to other schools' decisions about when to make adjustments.

Professor Schultheiss asked why the review considers higher-end outliers when adjustments downward are clearly not going to be made. Vice Provost Hammond responded that the upper outliers assist in understanding the overall picture; if, historically, there is a higher-paid faculty member as compared to everyone else, that will impact the whole picture for that school.

Professor Core asked several questions about the model:

- Does the model account for individual departments within CCAS?
- What happens to the standard deviation when outliers are adjusted and move into the non-outlier range; does this create a new mean and standard deviation?
- When adjustments are made, are increases based on a formula or matrix?
- Is gender considered in the model?

Vice Provost Hammond responded that departments are included in the analysis (Professor Wirtz subsequently clarified that departments come up in the dean discussions but not at the higher-level model analysis). There is not a fixed rate of adjustment; the deans consider a number of factors when determining what, if any, adjustments to make. Gender and race were originally accounted for in the model; the analysis now looks for any potential reason that salaries are differing on the basis of an illegitimate factor and whether an individual is being paid comparably to someone else with similar time in rank. Because of the way the model works, there will always be some variability; the analysis finds that there are always individuals who are >1 or <1 standard deviation of the mean for legitimate reasons. Vice Provost Hammond noted that the best way to bring issues around the model into the conversation is to communicate with their office or the Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policies committee (ASPP); the Office of Institutional Research also works closely with Faculty Affairs to improve the analysis.

Professor Wirtz clarified that, when talking about the mean in this analysis, one is not talking about a broad mean but rather about a regression line considering both time in rank and salary. The analysis is of how far an individual is from that regression line. Because the line is positively sloped, the expected value of salary increases with increases of time-in-rank, so over time, the line increases, so the analysis is not really about a mean but instead about an expected value on the regression line.

Professor Gore asked whether there is a way to control for average performance or performance over time. Vice Provost Hammond responded that the model's data output is one piece of the puzzle; conversations with the deans and associate deans about performance provide more information.

Professor Mylonas asked about salary benchmarking, and Vice Provost Hammond responded that this will be in next month's Core Indicators report.

Professor McAlister asked how the lack of merit increases in a strong-performing year for a faculty member is reconciled with a weaker subsequent year that includes merit increases. Vice Provost Hammond responded that the instructions to the deans are more simplified, asking them to account for past performance that hasn't been accounted for yet in the merit process.

Professor Cseh asked whether the amount allocated when moving from one rank to another is fixed, noting that a \$10K bump used to be the fixed and expected promotion increase at GW and elsewhere. Vice Provost Hammond responded that they would like to look into this further to provide an accurate response; they have seen variation across schools and cannot account for that in today's meeting. Professor Cseh noted that there are differences by school and by gender at GW in this, and Vice Provost Hammond confirmed they would look at the data on this. Professor Cseh asked if merit increases would be awarded this year. Vice Provost Hammond stated that their understanding is that GW is planning for merit this coming year.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS TO BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

None.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. Nominations for Senate Standing Committee Membership

The following committee nominations were approved by unanimous consent:

- Benefits Advisory Committee
 - Patricia Hernandez (CCAS, ASPP Co-Chair)
- ASPP
 - Arlene Pericak (SON)/voting

II. Senate Standing Committee Reports

The following interim report was received by the Senate office and has been posted to the Senate website:

- [Educational Policy & Technology interim report](#)

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Professor Orti offered the following motion:

I move that the Senate, at the request of the administration¹, move into executive session for a presentation on and discussion of the new budget model, and that the following individuals be invited to attend the executive session: President Granberg, Interim Provost Lach, Executive Vice President Bruno Fernandes, Senior Vice President Scott Mory, Deputy Provost Terry Murphy, Vice President Hemant Bakshi, Vice Provost Michael Glatzer, Interim Vice Provost Emily Hammond, Vice President for Communications and Marketing Ellen Moran, all deans, all Senate standing committee chairs, the Senate office staff, the Parliamentarian, the Registrar, and (from Grant/Thornton) Rick Strasser. I further move that time in executive session be limited to no more than 45 minutes, at which point the Senate will vote either to extend the session or to return to regular session.

¹ Professor Orti clarified that the administration originally proposed a special session separate from the Faculty Senate meeting structure. FSEC felt that an executive session would provide the best opportunity for optimal attendance.

The President asked that the motion be amended to include Richard Weitzner on the list of invited personnel, Professor Eakle seconded the motion.

Professor Wirtz expressed his concern that executive sessions do a disservice to the Senate's constituents, who ought to be entitled to hear presented information and debate, especially on important topics such as the budget model. In view of this concern, he noted that he asked Professor Orti this week whether he was comfortable that there was adequate reason to place this topic in an executive session, keeping it from the Senate's constituency. He reported that Professor Orti had this conversation with the administration and was convinced that the executive session was warranted. Because of this, Professor Wirtz noted, he would support the motion but expressed his concern that, with numerous executive sessions in the past couple of years, the Senate seems to be going more in the direction of secrecy; he hoped this did not represent a precedent.

Professor Warren expressed his view that the Senate should include the option for an executive session on each agenda in order to provide the opportunity to hold discussions on sensitive topics that aren't then publicly reportable.

The motion was adopted by unanimous consent, and the Senate moved into executive session at 3:35pm.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate returned to open session at 5:06pm, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:06pm.

THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

Resolution 26/5: Extending the Code of Academic Integrity Addendum

Educational Policy &
Technology committee



Academic Integrity Reports, Spring 2023 to 2025

In AY 2023-24:

- Academic Integrity reports increased 45%
- Number of faculty panelists declined 27%
- Faculty Senate & SGA approved a one-year addendum to the Code of Academic Integrity and renewed it in Spring 2025

AI reports stabilized in AY 2024-25, but:

- Faculty panelists numbers are still down
- 55% more cases *overran* spring semester

Full CESA report is in the EPT interim report

	SP 25	SP 24	SP 23	Average of SP 24 & 23	% Change from last two year's average (except in cases of Warnings, which is one year)
Total Academic Integrity Reports January 13 - May 18	103	102	70	86	20% increase
Percentage of reports alleging 'cheating'	81.5%	73.5%	54.2%	63.8%	
Number of reports alleging 'cheating'	84	75	38	56	50% increase
Percentage of reports alleging 'plagiarism'	28.1%	19.6%	44.2%	31.9%	
Number of reports alleging 'plagiarism'	29	20	31	25	16% increase
Number of cases resolved as 'Warnings'	13	21			38.09% decrease
Percentage of cases resolved as 'Warnings'	12.6%	20.38%			
Numbers of cases resolved as agreements	64	53	56	54	18.51% increase
Number of SP cases open on May 18	31	20	18	19	63.15% increase
Percentage of SP cases open on May 18	30%	19.6%	25.7%	22.65%	
Number of Faculty Panelists	23*	24	33	28	17.85% decrease

Resolution 26/5

Extends the addendum reducing standard panels from **five** members to May 2027: “a full Academic Integrity Panel (AIP) shall consist of **three** members of the University Integrity and Conduct Council. All members of the AIP shall be voting members. At least one must be a student and at least one must be a faculty member.”

Removes limited permission for ad hoc panels of **two** members from the addendum

Requires CESA to report data to Faculty Senate and SGA again before Spring 2027

Resolution 26/5

Encourages faculty to join the University Integrity and Conduct Council

- Previous efforts in Spring 2025: 60 volunteers but 23 completed training

Encourages CESA efforts to translate more faculty volunteers into panelists

Encourages the Provost and EPT to review if permanent changes to the Code of Academic Integrity are appropriate, based on current and 2026 data

**THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY**

WASHINGTON, DC