



**Report & Recommendations of the Subcommittee on the Senate Budget Committee
Georgetown University
November 2025**

I. Introduction

Georgetown’s Faculty Senate has had a budget committee for at least three decades. That committee—officially known as the Senate University Budget Committee (the “Committee”)—has been and remains an important part of shared governance.

Given its importance, and because the role and composition of the Committee have not been formally examined since its creation, in 2023 the Faculty Senate formed the Senate Subcommittee on the Senate University Budget Committee (the “Subcommittee”).¹ The Subcommittee believes that it is a particularly appropriate time to re-examine and formalize the role of the Committee. First, when functioning well, the Committee offers a critical opportunity for faculty and administrators to openly and effectively collaborate in the spirit of trust and with the best interests of the University at the fore. Second, and relatedly, in times of constrained resources, the Committee must grapple with fraught and difficult issues, making a clear scope and charge even more essential.

The work of this Subcommittee can neither mandate trust nor definitively boost the financial health of this institution. We hope, however, that the research, analysis, and discussion we have conducted since the fall of 2023 will move us toward a more effective and efficient Committee and an even better exercise of shared governance.

This report documents our efforts and proposes a path forward. In particular, in its final section, the report provides an overview and explanation of language that the Subcommittee proposes be added to the Faculty Senate Constitution elaborating on the Committee’s role. (A redline appears at Appendix A.) This report also contains several recommendations regarding the future composition and functioning of the Committee.

¹ The only other standing committee affiliated with the Faculty Senate is the Senate Steering Committee. Several years ago, the Senate charged a separate subcommittee with examining the role and functioning of the Steering Committee and crafting a formal charge for it.

II. Background
a. Charge

In September of 2023, the Senate formed the Subcommittee and charged it with the following:

To review the current guidelines, composition and terms/term limits, and if needed, propose revisions that would amend the current Faculty Handbook guidelines. Part of the revisions would be an articulated charge for the Budget Committee. Please consider the need for diversity, equity, and campus representation in your assessment and revisions, and use guiding principles (to be developed by the Subcommittee) to construct any revisions.

The charge also noted “that there are no current guidelines for the Senate Budget Committee in the Senate Constitution.” The only guidance is a statement on the Senate website that says:

According to the Faculty Senate Constitution, in the Faculty Handbook, “The Senate shall have authority to discuss and express its views on any matter of general University interest, and to make recommendations to the President and Board of Directors, and to the University faculty.” This includes making recommendations concerning “The University’s budget, financial status, and financial policies, informed by examination of the University’s financial statements and plans.” The Senate discharges this function through the Senate University Budget Committee, a standing committee of the Senate appointed by the Senate Steering Committee.

The charge emphasized “that this [language from the Faculty Senate Constitution] says nothing other than that the Senate University Budget Committee can make recommendations concerning the University’s budget, financial status, etc., to the President and Board of Directors.”

b. History of the Committee

The Committee was established by the Senate Steering Committee and first met in November 1997. At that time, it was called the “Senate Standing Committee of University Budget and Finance.” The Committee was composed of both faculty and administrators, and its role was important in that moment because of a budget crisis at the University and especially at its Medical Center.

For virtually the entirety of its existence, the Committee was chaired (or co-chaired) by Wayne Davis. Professor Davis also served as the Senate President for much of this same period.

At points during its incarnation, the Committee has made annual reports to the full Senate about any actions of the Committee and its views on the University finances. Based on our Subcommittee’s interviews, at least one of those involved felt these reports did not generate much interest or benefit at the time, but still believed they were an important exercise.

Currently, the Committee has approximately 35 members. About half of those members are faculty members. The remaining half are administrators, including University and campus COOs, CFOs, and others. A list of Committee members is attached as Appendix B to this report.

III. Framing of the Subcommittee's Work

Early in the Subcommittee's work, and in accordance with our charge, we drafted "guiding principles." These principles were based on members' expertise, experience, and goals. They were also based on our research regarding faculty governance and budgeting at other institutions. We revisited and revised these principles at several points so that they better articulated our evolving understanding of how the Committee should function. The final iteration of the principles is the following:

- The Committee's work is central to the enterprise of shared governance.
- The Committee should be a collaborative body—meaning that its members should work collaboratively among themselves and also with the broader University community.
- The Committee's work is both forward looking and backward looking, but the majority of its time and effort should go to the former.
- The Committee should serve in an advisory capacity for the Senate as a whole. The Committee should also advise the Board of Directors, President, EVPs, COO, CFO, and the faculty.
- The Committee's work should be transparent to the extent possible, but significant components of it might require confidentiality.
- Whenever possible, the Committee's communications with the Senate or others should be intelligible even to those without financial expertise.

IV. Information Gathering & Themes

The Subcommittee's research took two, parallel paths. We reviewed the functioning of faculty budget committees at other institutions. This was done through examining publicly available information. We also enlisted the help of reference librarians at the Law Center who amassed and summarized such materials. To complement this, the Subcommittee held a series of conversations with faculty and administrators who have or had a connection to the Committee. Among those interviewed were current and past Committee chairs, the University's Chief Operating Officer and Chief Financial Officer, the chief financial officers of various campuses, and Committee members both longtime and new.

The Subcommittee began our information-gathering process with few expectations or assumptions, but we quickly found that themes emerged from our interviews. Below is a summary of these themes. The summary obviously cannot account for each and every opinion, but does attempt to provide a fair representation of the range of opinions expressed.

Committee Advisory Role

Although the Faculty Senate Constitution says virtually nothing about the role of the Committee, it defines the role of the Senate when it comes to financial matters. The Senate is empowered to “express its views” and “make recommendations” to the “President, Board of Directors, and to the University faculty” on the “University’s budget, financial status, and financial policies, informed by examination of the University’s financial statements and plans.” The Subcommittee interprets this as meaning that the Committee has an advisory role, and when interviewees were asked what they understood an advisory role means, the responses varied, but some common threads included:

- Certain faculty members don’t feel they are engaged by administrators or that they are asked big or important questions, and some faculty do not feel that the Committee is given the information that it needs to weigh in meaningfully on financial issues.
- Although the Faculty Senate Constitution only mentions advising the President, Board, and faculty, Committee leadership currently also views the EVPs as key recipients of advice.
- The Committee should have the opportunity to understand and offer counsel on the University’s major financial decisions that impact teaching, research, and scholarship. Faculty members want administrators to engage them, share challenges, explain what it is like to be in their shoes, and share the information that would allow faculty to contribute meaningfully to strategizing and advising on decision making. Faculty members would like to be engaged early in the process so that engagement doesn’t feel pro forma. They would like administrators to truly believe that getting faculty input helps them and the University fulfill its mission.
- Much, even most, of the Committee’s work should be forward-looking; that is, it should be advising on plans and future projects. This could mean helping administrators think through perspectives they may not have examined without faculty input and collaborating with administrators to strategize.
- Correspondingly, the Committee should avoid being reactive and attempt to limit the time it spends reviewing and dissecting past decision-making except to the extent it is pertinent to future planning efforts and plans themselves. (Interviewees noted that a certain amount of “backward-looking” work is important. For example, comparing expected results to actual results helps one understand the extent to which the University is able to accurately forecast financial information.)
- In advising, the Committee should be acting on behalf of faculty and bringing the faculty perspective to bear.
- Truly serving in an advisory capacity would likely require a greater investment of faculty time and effort than the current Committee requires. Many faculty feel that the extra work would be worthwhile.
- Committee members should keep confidentiality on topics that require it.
- Although the Committee’s recommendations may have “no teeth,” the President, Board of Directors, and EVPs should consider the recommendations in good faith.
- The Committee should be communicating with the broader faculty about University financial initiatives and plans and any related recommendations.

Committee Communication

The Subcommittee was interested in thinking about precisely who was being advised and how. The foundational documents already seem to have a bit to say about this. Per the Senate Constitution, the Senate has the power “to make recommendations to the President and Board of Directors, and to the University faculty” on matters related to finances and the budget. The Faculty Senate website indicates that the Senate “discharges this function through the Senate University Budget Committee.” This seems to indicate that the Committee is empowered to advise the President, Board of Directors, and others directly, and need not go through or obtain the blessing of the Faculty Senate. This is also suggested by the composition of the Committee, which includes the Senate President and Vice Presidents.

To the extent that the Committee has played this advisory role, it seems to have done so largely via informal mechanisms. For example, President Emeritus Jack DeGioia had a long-standing policy of meeting with the Senate President and Vice Presidents once per month with an agenda to be determined by the Senate officer. This gave Senate officers the chance to raise issues of fiscal significance. The Board has a Subcommittee on Faculty Affairs that meets with the Senate officers at each of the regular Board meetings. Senate officers have occasionally used that time to raise concerns regarding budget-related issues directly with Board members. Given the attendance of numerous administrators at Committee meetings, some advising inevitably happens via conversation at those meetings. Yet, on the whole, the Committee does not regularly issue advice via report or in any other formal way.

Scope of the Committee: Substance

Interviewees were uniform in their desire to see greater clarity brought to the purpose and charge of the Committee. Here are some themes that arose from our conversations regarding the scope of the Committee’s work:

- As currently conceived, the substantive scope of what the Committee covers is broad;
- In addition to addressing issues at the University level, it regularly dives into issues at the campus level.
- Under the three-campus budgeting model, there is often significant faculty engagement on budget issues at the campus and/or school level. Some administrators described a back-and-forth with faculty and faculty leadership in shaping their school and campus-level budgets.
- Campuses and schools have different cultures as well as different approaches to budgeting and financial matters, for example, the setting of tuition and faculty compensation.
- The Law Campus has an active finance committee. Some faculty on the Main Campus are considering trying to reinstitute one.
- The financial issues addressed at the University level that impact all campuses are narrower in scope than those at the campus and school level. One key issue is the Central Services Allocation, which refers to the method of cost-sharing between campuses for University functions that benefit all, such as the President’s Office.

- At the time of this writing, there may be some overlap in the functions of the Committee and the COO Advisory Committee.
- At some universities, the role of the Senate is to ensure that the budget processes at the school or campus level work as they are supposed to, with plenty of faculty input.
- Beyond serving faculty, in its current form, the Committee may serve an important information-sharing and coordination function for administrators.

Scope of the Committee: Members

Interviewees—both faculty and administrators—stressed the importance of having a Committee composed of members with a diversity of perspectives, expertise, and years of service to the University and the Committee. Some stressed the importance of members having some basic financial literacy, but did not believe that literacy had to be “preexisting” and agreed it could be developed through a Committee onboarding process. No one indicated that they believed certain expertise should be required of incoming Committee members. Some interviewees noted they would appreciate having faculty Committee members who were “University citizens” and wouldn’t always be champions of their particular campus or interest group. Numerous interviewees felt it was important that Committee members be active and not retired faculty members. This is especially true if the Committee aims to be forward looking—the thought being that active faculty members will be the ones living with decisions. Term limits on all Committee members would also help to disperse knowledge about University finances and budgeting to more faculty members.

There was widespread agreement that the Committee is too big—although the reasons for this belief varied. Concerns included: the need for confidentiality, a lack of flexibility or slowness to action, and the difficulty of saying hard or challenging things to a big audience.

Several expressed the belief that a smaller group would lead to better participation, agility, richer dialogues, and more opportunities for building trust. Another possibility, perhaps even in addition to limiting the number of participants in the Committee overall, would be to have subcommittees.

Many interviewees, even administrators, believe that the ratio of administrators to faculty is too high. As one administrator we interviewed noted, there is awkwardness in being “on a committee advising myself.” With that said, others felt that if this is a Committee in which shared governance is being practiced, it might not be the right answer to only have faculty on the Committee.

Committee Meetings

On this topic there was also agreement on the following issues:

- The Committee meets too often. Some administrators spend an “extraordinary” amount of time getting ready for the meetings and often feel that they are generating issues for

meetings (suggesting that these are not issues that truly merit discussion or might not be the most pressing or helpful issues for discussion). Administrators sometimes feel the topics covered are too in the weeds.

- Fewer and more impactful meetings per semester would be welcomed by both administrators and faculty. It might be possible to cover four or five bigger topics per year. These could include, for example, the basic budget, the University's financial profile (i.e., its performance and condition of the balance sheet), the Central Services Allocation, and major University initiatives.
- Administrators sometimes feel under siege during the meetings and are in "survival mode." It often seems that the Committee functions more in an oversight than an advisory role.
- Administrators are cognizant and concerned in putting together presentations to the Committee to do so in a way that doesn't create conflict or drive wedges between campuses.

Some interviewees indicated that meetings could be streamlined by providing metrics and data to Committee members through dashboards or another like mechanism. Which metrics were used would need to be routinely reevaluated and updated and thought would need to be given to what "thresholds" with respect to given metrics should result in faculty concern. Several interviewees indicated that too much time at meetings is taken up with routine and backward-looking reporting when the same time could be used for dialogue and planning. Having an onboarding process for members might also eliminate the need to repeatedly cover certain basics at meetings.

Work Product

Related to "Committee Communication" (above), the Subcommittee also discussed what work product interviewees would like to see from the Committee. Here are some thoughts that were shared with us:

- The Committee should be reporting out to the Faculty Senate at least annually.
- Some administrators noted that going to the Board and presenting a budget with a "unified approach" between faculty and administrators would be welcome.

V. Recommendations

a. Language for the Faculty Senate Constitution & Explanation of that Language

The language proposed to be added to the Faculty Senate Constitution can be found in Appendix A. It has two aims: 1) to detail the make-up of the Committee and 2) to clarify the Committee's charge.

With respect to the makeup of the Committee, the Subcommittee is aiming for a Committee that is small enough to maximize the possibility of agility, participation, confidentiality (when needed), and the ability to build relationships and trust. It also aims to invert the ratio of faculty to administrators so that the Committee is majority faculty.

Specifically, the proposed language indicates that voting members of the Committee are full-time, active faculty members only. These voting members include the Committee Chair, the immediate past Chair, Senate officers, and two additional faculty members from each of the Main, Medical, and Law campuses. Voting members are appointed by the Senate Officers and confirmed by the Senate. They are limited to two three-year terms and their second term is subject to the endorsement by the Senate. By September 1 of the final year of the Chair's term, the Senate Officers will nominate one member of the Committee to serve as the incoming Chair. This nominee must be approved by the Senate.

Although past practice has been that the Senate President serves as chair or co-chair of the Committee, the proposed language only requires that the Chair be nominated by the Senate Officers and confirmed by the Senate. The Chair need not be the Senate President or even a Senator. The proposed language also caps the Chair's service to two, three-year terms. The proposal also calls for a role for the immediate past Chair. The immediate past Chair would serve for one year after the completion of their maximum two terms as Chair provided that they are willing, available, and remain an active, full-time faculty member.

Non-voting members include the University COO and CFO as well as the EVPs. Other administrators would be invited to Committee meetings as needed.

With respect to the Committee's charge, the draft language attempts to make clear that the Committee's role is advisory. In other words, the Committee is a partner and a collaborator with administrators in plans and initiatives that have a significant financial impact on the University. This would include strategic planning. Specifically, the Committee advises the Board, Presidents, EVPs, COO, CFO, Faculty Senate and faculty. The proposed language also asks that the Committee receive regular information about the financial health of the University as well as any information the Committee needs to advise on major University plans and initiatives that have a significant financial impact.

b. Other Recommendations

- The Committee should narrow its substantive scope as well as encourage and support infrastructure for meaningful faculty engagement at the school and campus levels.

As noted, Committee members are often presented with information in a campus-by-campus way. Meetings sometimes delve into campus-specific issues. Although this may, at times, be necessary given that the University's financial health depends on that of its three campuses, a sentiment prevailed that the Committee was too often operating at too local a level.

One way to assist the Committee in shifting its purview to focus more on University-level concerns would be to support a rich infrastructure for faculty advising on financial issues at the campus level. With this infrastructure in place, it would, hopefully, engender trust in Committee members that faculty colleagues had the opportunity and means to weigh in on campus-level decision making.

Proposed actions:

- Working with campus CFOs, the Committee should support efforts to ensure the infrastructure is in place for faculty to have meaningful input at the appropriate level. This could involve supporting and/or invigorating school processes to advise deans and school finance directors on resource generation and allocation decisions. We expect that in each school this infrastructure might look different. However, we would encourage school finance directors (with faculty involvement) to collaborate on best practices and to align between the schools, to the degree possible, the types of financial decisions on which faculty are advising. That way the members of the Committee—faculty and administrators alike—could have confidence about what types of decisions were made with faculty input at local levels.
- To the extent finance or budget committees exist at the school or campus level, consideration should be given to including members of the Committee either as members or advisors. For example, two members of the Law Center’s Finance Committee also serve on the Committee. This, of course, allows for fluidity of information and expertise from the school to the campus and the University level.
- The Committee should implement practices aimed at keeping its work more forward looking.

As it stands, much of the Committee’s meeting time is taken up by administrators presenting information about projects that are already underway or financial decisions that have already been made. If the Committee were truly fulfilling its advisory role, as the Subcommittee envisions it, meetings would involve short presentations on issues in the planning stages and then significant time devoted to dialogue so that faculty input can be brought to bear.

Proposed action:

- Create means for providing routine financial information to the Committee regularly and predictably in a way that would allow members to review it outside of meeting time and see easily whether there had been changes in key indicators. This could be accomplished, for example, by having a password-protected site that includes data dashboards.
- The focus of meetings should be major financial plans and decisions that impact teaching, research, and scholarship, where a faculty lens is critical in the early-planning stages.
- The Committee should hold at least one closed meeting each year for faculty only.

Currently, agendas for the Committee are arrived at collectively between faculty and administrators. This makes sense in that faculty need some guidance from administrators about work flow, including upcoming issues about which administrators need advice. At the same time, as a faculty committee, faculty priorities and concerns should be at the fore. And faculty members on the Committee could be more proactive in agenda setting. To strike this balance, we recommend holding a meeting for voting members of the Committee at least once per year to brainstorm and prioritize agenda items for subsequent meetings. This would make the plenary meetings as efficient and productive as possible. In advance of the faculty-only meetings, input should be solicited from all members of the Committee.

- The Committee should consider creating subcommittees on specific topics.

To realize the goals of a more nimble and participatory Committee, breaking into smaller groups to tackle specific issues would likely be helpful. Creating subcommittees might also mean that the entire Committee meets less frequently.

Proposed action:

- Give further consideration to whether subcommittees might be a useful mechanism to further the Committee’s advisory mission.
 - Determine subjects, charges, and sizes of subcommittees as well as a process for revisiting these decisions with some regularity. We would recommend that subcommittees be on topics that pertain to all campuses rather than campus-specific topics. For example, subcommittees could be formed around topics like salaries, infrastructure, or Capitol Campus.
- The Committee should strive to create an onboarding process for new members.

Currently, new members of the Committee are not provided with any education about the Committee before joining it. Of course, Committee members may arrive with their own expertise about the Committee’s functioning gleaned from faculty-governance service or elsewhere. Members might also have financial expertise, both professional or personal. Regardless, our Subcommittee recommends that some formal onboarding be put in place.

Proposed action:

- The COO and CFO’s office create a series of “white papers” or “one-pagers” on topics of ongoing importance to finances at Georgetown. This might include, for example, an explanation of the Central Services Allocation plan or the Engie energy deal. Not only would these better prepare Committee members for their service, but they would significantly lessen the burden on University administrators to frequently re-explain fundamental issues at meetings. The assumption would be that Committee members have a familiarity with the topics covered by the white papers. White papers could be updated as needed and perhaps they could link to or reference more in depth information on the relevant topics. Administrators could create new white papers as needed.
- The Committee and administrators together create a short training to be attended by new members of the Committee.

- The Committee should report to the Faculty Senate on its work and advise the Faculty Senate as needed.

As part of its advising role, the Committee should share information, make recommendations to, and listen to the wider faculty. Even as already drafted, the Faculty Senate Constitution seems to contemplate that the Committee will report to faculty. It indicates that the Senate function, that is discharged through the Committee, is to “discuss and express its views...and to make recommendations...to the University faculty...[on] [t]he University’s budget, financial status, and financial policies.” This reporting was done in past years, and we would recommend it recommence.

Proposed actions:

- The Committee should report at least once a year to the Senate on its activities.
 - The Committee should facilitate discussions between its members and members of the Senate as needed to assist with the Committee’s advisory role.
 - To facilitate this work, administrators should be extremely clear with Committee members when they provide information to the Committee whether that information can be shared.
- The Committee would benefit from the existence of a University-wide strategic planning process.

In spending considerable time thinking about the Committee’s advisory role, the Subcommittee concluded that the Committee would and should be a vital player in any strategic planning that the University undertakes in the future. The kind of envisioning, problem-solving, and creative thinking that such a process entails is precisely the kind of work that members of the Budget Committee feel they have signed up to do.

Proposed action:

- When administrators engage in strategic planning that implicates University finances, the Committee should be invited to be a partner in that process.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Carroll (chair)
Anthony Arend
Stephen Byers
Kathryn de Luna
Ian Gale

Appendix A

Redline of Faculty Senate Constitution

I. Functions of the Faculty Senate

...

d. The Senate may make recommendations about other matters, including, but not limited to:

1. Appointment of the University President, Executive Vice Presidents of the campuses (the Main Campus, Medical Center, and Law Center), and Deans of schools;
2. Procedures for the selection of Department Chairs or heads of similar units;
3. Tracks or frameworks for non-tenure line faculty;
4. Faculty governance policies and practices at the campus or school level;
5. The University's budget, financial status, and ~~financial policies~~, **major financial plans and decisions that impact teaching, research, and scholarship**, ~~informed by examination of the University's financial statements and plans~~;
6. Grants and gifts of general University interest;
7. Faculty research grant procedures and policies;
8. Faculty and staff salaries, retirement plans, and fringe benefits;
9. Facilities, including physical campus plans;
10. University convocations;
11. Honorary degrees; and
12. Educational and student affairs of general interest.

...

6. Officers, ~~and~~ Steering Committee, **and Budget Committee**

- a. The Officers of the Faculty Senate are the President, a Vice President from each campus, and a Secretary-Treasurer. Only members of the Senate are eligible to serve as Officers.
- b. The Senate Officers will serve three-year terms, beginning September 1. The President and Secretary-Treasurer will have a limit of two consecutive full terms.
 - i. At the end of their term, the Senate shall elect Officers from its membership at the first regular meeting following election of new Senators.
 - ii. In the event that a vacancy occurs, there shall be a special election to choose a successor for the remainder of the Officer's term.
 - iii. In either case, a Nominating Committee shall be appointed by the Steering Committee subject to confirmation by the Senate. Nominations for these Officers may be made by the Nominating Committee and/or from the floor.
- c. The Steering Committee shall be composed of the following voting members:
 - i. The Senate Officers;
 - ii. The University President's designee;
 - iii. The campus Executive Vice Presidents;

- iv. Other members appointed by the Senate Officers and the University President's designee, subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The EVPs may send a designee to Steering Committee meetings to act in their place.

- d. The Senate President serves as a channel of communication between the University administration and the Steering Committee, chairs the Steering Committee, sets the annual schedule for Senate and Steering Committee meetings, and manages the Senate budget and administrative staff. The Senate President may delegate a Senate Vice President or the Secretary-Treasurer to act temporarily in their place.
- e. The Secretary-Treasurer is responsible for preparing minutes of Senate and Steering Committee meetings and ensuring that they are properly approved and recorded. The Senate President may delegate management of the Senate budget to the Secretary-Treasurer.
- f. The Steering Committee shall have the following authority:
 - i. To serve as a channel of communication between the administration and the faculty regarding issues of general University interest.
 - ii. To receive communications from any member of the University community concerning matters to be put upon the agenda of the Senate;
 - iii. To establish the agenda for Senate meetings, excepting that:
 - 1. Any member of the Senate may, at a meeting of the Senate, ask the body to discuss a particular matter;
 - 2. Any member of the University community may ask the body to discuss a matter during an open forum portion of the meeting set in the agenda.
 - iv. Subject to confirmation by the Senate, to appoint and charge standing and special committees of the Senate. While the Steering Committee shall refer matters to committees, the committees are free to consider additional matters within their charge on their own initiative.
 - v. To nominate, subject to confirmation by the Senate:
 - 1. One member to the executive faculties (the principal academic policy-making bodies) of the campuses and schools, unless the campus caucus or school faculty is the policy-making body;
 - 2. One member to other standing and special faculty committees whose jurisdiction and membership are university-wide;
 - 3. Two members to faculty committees established by the University President, including search committees for Executive Vice Presidents and School Deans; and
 - vi. To call special meetings of the Senate.
- g. The Budget Committee composition shall be as follows:
 - i. Voting members are:
 - 1. The Chair;
 - 2. The immediate past Chair;
 - 3. The Senate President, Senate Vice Presidents, and Senate Secretary-Treasurer; and
 - 4. Two additional faculty members from each of the Main, Medical, and Law campuses.

- ii. Non-voting members are:
 - 1. The University Chief Operating Officer and Chief Financial Officer; and
 - 2. The campus Executive Vice Presidents. The campus Executive Vice Presidents may send a designee to Budget Committee meetings to act in their place.
- iii. The Chair of the Budget Committee shall be nominated by the Senate Officers and confirmed by the Senate. The Chair will serve a maximum of two three-year terms as Chair, beginning September 1. A second term as Chair is subject to the endorsement of the Senate, which requires a majority vote of its voting members. After completing two terms as Chair, the Chair may remain on the Committee for one additional year as the immediate past Chair if willing, available, and still a member of the full-time faculty.
- iv. Voting members of the Budget Committee must be full-time faculty. They shall be appointed by the Senate Officers and confirmed by the Senate. Non-officer members of the Budget Committee will serve a maximum of two three-year terms, beginning September 1. A second term is subject to the endorsement of the Senate, which requires a majority vote of its voting members. By September 1 of the final year of the Chair's term, the Senate Officers shall nominate and the Senate shall confirm one member of the Committee to serve as the incoming Chair. Reaching a term limit as a non-officer voting member of the Budget Committee does not preclude service as an officer.
- h. The Budget Committee shall serve the following roles and have the following responsibilities:
 - i. To make recommendations under Section I.d.5, above. These recommendations would carry the endorsement of the Budget Committee rather than the full Senate. The Senate may also make recommendations under Section I.d.5.
 - ii. To participate with administrators in strategic planning at the University level.
 - iii. To advise the Board, President, campus Executive Vice Presidents, Chief Operating Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Faculty Senate, and faculty regarding the University budget, financial status, and major financial plans and decisions that impact teaching, research, and scholarship.
 - iv. To ensure the Budget Committee can execute its role, it will receive regular information about the financial health of the University as well as any information the Budget Committee needs to advise on major University plans and initiatives that have a significant financial impact.

Appendix B

Senate University Budget Committee

2025-26

Faculty Senate Officers

1. George Luta (Co-Chair, Department of Biostatistics, Bioinformatics, and Biomathematics, School of Medicine and President of the Faculty Senate) (2025)
2. Susan Mulrone (Co-Chair, Dept. of Pharmacology & Physiology, School of Medicine, and Immediate Past President of the Faculty Senate) (2021)
3. Andreas Kern (McCourt School of Public Policy, Senate VP for the Main Campus) (2025)
4. Anupam Chander (Georgetown Law, Senate VP for the Law Center) (2025)
5. Jessica Jones (Department of Biochemistry and Molecular and Cellular Biology, School of Medicine, Senate VP for the Medical Center) (2023)

Main Campus

6. Irfan Nooruddin (Dept. of Government, College of Arts & Sciences and School of Foreign Service) (2025)
7. Kathryn de Luna (MCEF Chair, Dept of History) (2021)
8. Allison Koester (McDonough School of Business) (2019)
9. Jim Angel (McDonough School of Business) (2023)
10. Alison Mackey (MCEF representative, Dept. of Linguistics) (2023)

Medical Center

11. Jason Tilan (School of Health) (2025)
12. Stephen Byers (Dept. of Oncology, School of Medicine) (2020)
13. Edilma Yearwood (School of Nursing) (2023)
14. Patrick Forcelli (Dept. of Pharmacology & Physiology, School of Medicine) (2023)

Georgetown Law

15. Emily Satterthwaite (Georgetown Law) (2023)
16. Hillary Sale (Georgetown Law) (2025)

Administration

17. Dave Green (Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer)
18. Hari Sastry (Chief Financial Officer)
19. Kristin Agatone (Chief Investment Officer)

20. Stella Apekey (Sr. Associate VP for Budget, Financial Planning and Treasury Management)
21. Michelle Dee (Assistant VP, Financial Management, University Services)
22. Willem Roos (Vice President of Finance, GUMC)
23. Jennifer Hayes-Klosteridis (Vice President of Strategic Management & Operations, GUMC)
24. Darryl Christmon (VP and Chief Operating Officer, Main Campus)
25. Alyscia Eisen (Vice President and Chief Business Officer, Main Campus)
26. Patrick Retton (Chief Operating Officer, Georgetown Law)
27. Laura Duke (Associate VP for Finance, Georgetown Law)

Ex Officio Members (Non-Voting)

28. Soyica Colbert (Interim Provost)
29. Norman Beauchamp (EVP, Medical Center)
30. Joshua Teitelbaum (Interim Dean, EVP Law Center)
31. R. Bartley Moore (VP for Advancement)
32. Tony Kinslow (VP and Chief Human Resources Officer)
33. Adam Donaldson (Vice President for Strategic Operations and Information Technology
AVP for Financial Strategy and Business Integration)
34. Kristen Consolo Hall (Senior Associate Vice President and Chief of Staff, Office of the for
the COO)
35. Charles DeSantis (AVP for University Benefits and Wellness)
36. Kate Seabold Brannon (Director of Financial Planning and Analysis)
37. Katharine Donato (designee appointed by the University President)
38. Elizabeth Decherd (University Counsel)