Categories of Faculty: A faculty member questioned the different categories of faculty, basing their creation on administrative action, not faculty action. All faculty members have professional responsibilities and that the ability for a faculty member to vote should be based on service, teaching and research. Other faculty members stated that they would like to extend voting rights on governance issues to non-tenured faculty.

Cross Disciplinary: Most journals that faculty members are encouraged to submit their scholarly work to do not accept cross disciplinary research. Because of this, faculty members often silo their research to get into respected journals by their department in order to meet qualifications for tenure.

Appeals to Faculty Code Changes: The process for compliance, justification and appeal must be clearer. A faculty member noted that when the Faculty Code has been overlooked, there has been nowhere to appeal changes. A major reason for the Board’s review of the Faculty Code during this academic year is that it has been amended only during tumult in the past, as opposed to an institutional review that does not take place in a vacuum. It was noted that the task force has been in dialogue with the Faculty Senate throughout the process.

Academic Freedom: A faculty member noted that GW must maintain its standards for academic freedom wherever its faculty and students are (e.g. China). Moreover, is academic freedom protected within departments when a junior faculty member questions something? Does he or she get shunned?

Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT): Tenure is a cultural issue as much as anything else. Each faculty member is assigned to a department and that department is responsible for that faculty member’s future. The department must identify whether or not they should be advanced. Centers and Institutes have different criteria for their faculty than departments. Does this inhibit cross disciplinary research? Further, when a faculty member applies for tenure, the process has little transparency and he/she is kept in the dark as to their status for as long as one year. When there is non-concurrence, the faculty member, who is under consideration, is not provided any rationale for denial or the non-concurrence of tenure process. The Faculty Code does not prescribe the tenure process, only the process for dealing with non-concurrence. Last, some faculty members are concerned that the desire to hire non-tenure track contract faculty is a short-term thought process that jeopardizes the long-term vision of the University.

Bylaws: Frustration was expressed by a faculty member in dealing with the Faculty Code with respect to school bylaws and department bylaws, and that there should be more alignment and more consistency between them. A question was raised about the absence of any comments about the relationship (e.g. responsibilities) between school administrators and University administrators, which in turn affects the relationship between a school’s leadership and its faculty.