

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
March 19, 2025, 3:00-4:15 p.m. | Online Meeting

Number of Attendees: 120 ([List of Names](#))

1. Call to Order

- The meeting was called to order by Solon Simmons at 3:01 PM.

2. Approval of Minutes

- Two sets of minutes were presented for approval: January 29 and February 12.
- No additions or corrections were noted.
- The minutes were approved as presented.

3. Introductions and Welcome

- Solon Simmons welcomed new attendees, including Chris Ackerman, Vice President for Human Resources and Chief HR Officer.
- Acknowledged the presence of visitor Alacbay.

4. Comments from Gregory Washington

- Gregory Washington provided an overview of recent activities and highlights:
 - Mentioned multiple meetings in the past three weeks, including faculty meetings and town halls.
 - Highlighted the university's continued success and growth in various areas:
 - Strong performance in online rankings, with 9 out of 13 categories ranked.
 - Research expenditures growing at close to 9%.
 - 86% of recent graduates employed in the DC metro area.
 - Undergraduate enrollment continues to grow, while graduate enrollment shows a slight decline of about 1.1%.
 - Addressed challenges related to executive orders and additional costs associated with athletics.
 - Expressed optimism about the university's strength and progress.

5. Q/A w President Washington

a. Pell Grants Shortfall

- **Melissa Broeckelman-Post:** Raised concerns about potential shortfall in Pell Grants and its impact.
- **Gregory Washington:** Confirmed that Pell Grants are currently not affected by the overall set of cuts. He emphasized the importance of staying updated with

headlines and assured that any major changes would be a national headline issue. For now, Pell Grants are safe.

b. Anti-Semitism Policy and Federal Investigation

- **Alexander Monea:** Expressed concerns about the new anti-Semitism policy adopted by the board and its implications, including being on a list of 60 universities targeted by the Trump administration.
- **Gregory Washington:** Highlighted the differences between George Mason and other institutions on the list. He explained that George Mason was under investigation for Title VI violations relating to anti-Semitic harassment and discrimination, which led to its inclusion on the list. He detailed the response sent to the federal government, updating them on initiatives and outcomes since the initial investigation.

c. Status of Student Activists

- **Tim Gibson:** Requested an update on the status of two students who were given four-year exclusion orders from campus.
- **Gregory Washington:** Explained that there are two processes at play: a student judicial process and a criminal process. The student judicial process is ongoing and will determine the students' return to campus. The criminal process has not filed any formal charges yet. He emphasized the importance of credible evidence that led to the search of the students' home and the ongoing analysis of information. He assured that the university is committed to keeping the campus safe and will follow due process.

d. Protection of Foreign National Scholars:

- **Delton Daigle:** Inquired about the institution's evolving protection measures for foreign national scholars. He highlighted recent visa revocations of a PhD student at Columbia and a scholar at Brown University. Delton emphasized the importance of updating guidance for foreign nationals, especially concerning free speech and academic freedom.
- **Gregory Washington:** Acknowledged the concern and emphasized his straightforward communication style. He expressed uncertainty about the reasons behind the visa and green card revocations. Washington highlighted the student's involvement in leading a protest effort without engaging in violence. He believed the federal government might struggle to prove its case against the student. Washington stressed the importance of free speech, regardless of agreement with the content. He underscored that freedom of speech is a fundamental American right and crucial for academic discourse. Washington

shared his personal experience with harsh criticisms and reiterated his support for the right to free expression.

e. **Concerns and Future Outlook:**

- President Washington expressed concern about the potential spread of indiscriminate targeting based on speech.
- He emphasized the need to protect free speech to maintain fundamental American values.
- Washington reaffirmed his commitment to upholding the right to free expression within the institution.

f. **Enrollment Concerns:**

- **Alok Berry:** Thanked Dr. Washington for his information and acknowledged George Mason University's effective handling of recent issues. Berry expressed concerns about the impact of national university issues on George Mason's enrollment and faculty recruitment for the upcoming academic year.
- **Gregory Washington:** Acknowledged the complexity of the question due to uncertainty. He highlighted the proactive measures taken by George Mason University to avoid situations like those faced by Columbia University. Washington emphasized the importance of a strategy for current foreign graduate students and postdocs, including creating an FAQ to guide them in the current environment. He stressed the need to manage outcomes and avoid damage to the institution, despite the unpredictable nature of external actions.

g. **Academic Freedom:**

- **Alexander Monea:** Followed up on President Washington's earlier comments about academic freedom. Monea highlighted Washington's point that faculty must organize and defend academic freedom themselves. He appreciated Washington's stance and mentioned upcoming AAUP meetings.
- **Gregory Washington:** Emphasized the importance of academic freedom for American higher education success. He provided examples of significant discoveries resulting from academic freedom, such as the first web browser and research on cow flatulence. Washington stressed that academic freedom is crucial for innovation and economic value. He urged faculty to actively defend academic freedom and not rely solely on others. Washington reassured that there is no immediate threat to academic freedom on campus but emphasized the need for vigilance.
- **Solon Simmons' Remarks:** Reiterated the alignment of leadership in support of academic freedom. He acknowledged the importance of defending academic freedom and mentioned the rector's support.

h. Support for Displaced Federal Workers:

- **Anna Pollack:** Inquired about George Mason University's role in providing resources, hiring, courses, or opportunities for displaced federal workers.
- **President Washington:** Stated that the university is developing a strategy to assist in retraining and re-placing these workers. Plans will be made public in the coming weeks. He emphasized the university's role in education and training, and its potential to contribute to the community during times of transition.

i. Free Speech and University Policy:

- **Eugene Kontorovich:** Raised concerns about the university's stance on free speech, particularly in relation to racially hateful or hostile speech. He referenced DEI training and prior understandings of university policy.
- **President Washington:** Clarified that the university's commitment to free speech aligns with the First Amendment, which includes carve-outs for threatening or harassing speech. He acknowledged the difficulty in defining such speech and shared personal experiences with hateful and racially motivated speech. He reiterated the university's track record of supporting free speech, even in racially charged situations.

j. "River to the Sea" Chant:

- **Solon Simmons:** Asked for President Washington's perspective on the "river to the sea" chant.
- **President Washington:** Stated that he considers the chant to be hate speech, although it is protected under the First Amendment. He referenced that he sought out the expertise of Erwin Chemerinsky, a free speech scholar, to help inform the university's policy on the topic.
- Solon Simmons mentioned that some argue the chant could represent a one-state solution inclusive of all, and therefore not inherently hateful.
- President Washington acknowledged that he understood the argument.

k. Legal Defense of University Funding:

- Solon Simmons: Inquired about the university's legal position in defending itself against illegitimate attempts to remove funding.
- President Washington: Affirmed that the university would seek legal counsel to defend its federal funding, which approaches \$280 million in expenditures. He emphasized that the university would defend these resources.

l. Other General Statements:

- President Washington stated that the university is trying to be consistent in its messaging.
- He also stated that “We are literally all in the same storm. We might be in different boats. But we're in definitely the same storm. And we're going to get through this together.”

6. **Agenda Reordering:**

- A motion was made to change the order of the agenda to address O&O (Organization and Operations) and faculty handbook business before other committee reports.
- The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

7. **Committee Reports / Activities**

a) **Senate Allocation for Next Year (O&O):**

- Catherine Sausville (O&O) presented the Senate allocation for the following year, noting a change in the College of Engineering and Computing (CEC) allocation. CEC's allocation was adjusted to 9 senators due to rounding, with the understanding that this could change in subsequent years based on FTEs. This brings the total number of senators to 52 for the upcoming AY,
- Mohan Venigalla inquired about the division of seats within CEC between the School of Engineering and the School of Computing, which was clarified as an internal college matter.
- A motion to approve the Senate allocation was made and passed by voice vote.

b) **Standing Rules Changes (Meeting Recordings) (O&O):**

- Catherine Sausville presented proposed changes to the standing rules regarding meeting recordings.
- The changes aimed to preserve the integrity of meetings and ensure free speech by limiting transcriptions to comments from Board of Visitors and administration representatives, along with the questions they answered.
- Vin Lacovara mentioned that the Ethics and Integrity Committee is working on a non-retaliation policy that would dovetail with the standing rule changes.
- A motion to approve the changes was made and passed by voice vote.

c) **Budget and Resources Committee Charge (O&O):**

- Catherine Sausville presented a proposed change to the Budget and Resources Committee charge, adding the responsibility of annually obtaining and posting faculty salary data and analysis on the Senate website.

- It was clarified that this is a current practice being formalized in the committee charge.
- A motion to approve the change was made and passed by voice vote.

d) **Faculty Handbook Revision Committee Charge (O&O):**

- Catherine Sausville presented proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee charge.
- Changes included requiring the committee chair to be a senator and adjusting the timeline for reviewing proposed revisions to two consecutive regular Senate meetings.
- Melissa Broeckelman-Post added that the language was made consistent with other policy changes, and that a sentence regarding special meetings was removed.
- John Dale asked for clarification on the non-retaliation clause, and it was clarified that it was related to the standing rule changes.
- A motion to approve the changes was made and passed by voice vote.

Motion to Extend Meeting Time: Mohan Venigalla made a motion to extend the meeting time to 4:30 PM. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

e) **Term Appointments Clarification (Faculty Handbook):**

- Melissa Broeckelman-Post presented a clarification of the language regarding term appointments.
- The change clarifies that term faculty with terminal degrees can have an initial appointment of up to three years at the rank of assistant, and up to five years at associate or full professor.
- The change does not affect the policy but clarifies the existing language.
- A motion to approve the change was made and passed by voice vote.

f) **Procedures for Renewal and Appointment of Department Chairs (Faculty Handbook):**

- Melissa Broeckelman-Post presented changes to the procedures for renewal and appointment of department chairs.
- The changes clarified the process for renewals versus searches and addressed the definition of "identity of use."
- John Dale inquired about the meaning of "try to reach consensus" in the context of disagreements during the search process.

- Melissa Broeckelman-Post and James Antony clarified that the provost would facilitate discussions to reach consensus but ultimately holds the final decision.
- A motion to approve the changes was made and passed by voice vote.

g) **Leave Program for Instructional Faculty (Study Leaves) (Faculty Handbook):**

- Melissa Broeckelman-Post presented changes to the leave program for instructional faculty.
- The changes clarified the six-year timeframe for study leaves and added a requirement for publishing procedures, criteria, and deadlines.
- A motion to approve the changes was made and passed by voice vote.

h) **Awarding Tenure at Time of Appointment (Tenure Upon Hire) (Faculty Handbook):**

- Melissa Broeckelman-Post presented proposed changes to streamline the process for awarding tenure upon hire.
- The changes aim to simplify the dossier process for candidates who have already earned tenure at their previous institution and are being hired at the same rank.
- The proposal suggests using job application materials to constitute the bulk of the dossier, rather than requiring additional external review letters.
- John Dale raised concerns about the confidentiality of external review letters and the potential for a lack of information about the previous tenure process.
- Discussion ensued regarding the use of reference letters and other application materials instead of new external reviews.
- The change is presented as a first read, and no vote was taken at this time.
- Melanie Knapp shared concerns from the law faculty regarding the streamlining of the tenure upon hire process, particularly the potential negative impact on a scholar's reputation if a hire does not proceed.
- James Antony echoed these concerns and emphasized the need to avoid creating poaching targets. He suggested strengthening the language to ensure scholarly rigor in the review process.
- Mohan Venigalla highlighted the time constraints involved in tenure upon hire and sought clarification on whether the streamlined process applies only to lateral hires at the same rank.
- Cristiana Stan raised concerns about the different standards applied to recommendation letters in the hiring process versus the tenure process, particularly regarding the inclusion of letters from collaborators.

- James Antony suggested making the search process more explicit, ensuring that candidates meet the necessary qualifications before being considered.
- Alexander Monea raised concerns regarding international hires.
- Further discussion focused on how to ensure the rigor of the search process and the quality of recommendation letters in lateral hires.

i) **Remand Process (Promotion and Tenure Appeals) (Faculty Handbook):**

- Melissa Broeckelman-Post presented a small change to the remand process for promotion and tenure appeals.
- The change clarifies the language regarding the "case files" submitted by UPTRAC, specifying that the "reason for the UPTRAC remand" must be explicitly addressed.
- The change aims to provide clarity and consistency in the appeal process.

j) **Grievance Procedures (Faculty Handbook):**

- Melissa Broeckelman-Post presented changes to the grievance procedures, specifically addressing the handling of academic freedom violations.
- The changes remove a line that required the entire faculty of a college or school to vote on a grievance committee's recommendation in cases of alleged academic freedom violations.
- The rationale for the change is to ensure consistency with other grievance procedures and to avoid inappropriately airing sensitive information to the entire faculty.

k) **Salary Increases (Faculty Handbook):**

- Melissa Broeckelman-Post presented proposed changes related to salary increases.
- The changes aim to increase transparency by requiring each college or school (or local units within them) to have a policy or documented process for determining and communicating merit-based increases.
- John Dale suggested notifying faculty matters committees about these changes.
- Zachary Schrag suggested including "local unit administrators" in the language regarding merit-based salary increases.

l) **Academic Policies Committee Report:**

- Douglas Eyman reported on the Graduate Council's approval of four policy updates: voluntary resignation (6441), secondary certificates (68), admitted master's degrees within other degrees (695), and a new degree, the specialist (611).

- Douglas Eyman also reported that the AI Task Force has created a website (jimmy.edu/AI) providing core principles and guidance on AI use, but no new institutional policy. Additional guidance on AI use for students, faculty, researchers, and business operations is expected by the end of the semester.

m) Faculty Matters Committee Report:

- Mohan Venigalla reported that the faculty evaluation of administrators is forthcoming, and discussions with the provost's office are ongoing.
- Mohan Venigalla also reported that the committee plans to bring a resolution at the next meeting addressing the board's resolution on anti-Semitism and University Policy 1201.

n) Nominations Committee Report:

- Richard T. Craig reported that two calls for nominations are being prepared: one for the university standing committee and the other for the Board of Visitors.

Comments for the Good of the Faculty:

- Solon Simmons emphasized the importance of representing colleagues during a difficult time and encouraged faculty to surface concerns.
- Solon Simmons stated that the board has been fairly direct and that the faculty's voice has been heard.
- Tim Gibson expressed a less optimistic view of the board's actions and looked forward to further debate.

8. Action Items:

a) Senate and CEC Actions:

- CEC Notification: The CEC will be notified of the additional Senate seat for the next year.
- Senate Website Update: The Senate website will include faculty salary data and analysis.

b) Faculty Handbook Committee Actions:

- Committee Chair Requirement: The committee will ensure the chair is a senator.
- Meeting Frequency: The committee will ensure two consecutive regular meetings are held to discuss handbook changes.
- Tenure Upon Hire:
 - The committee will address concerns regarding tenure upon hire, specifically scholarly rigor, the search process, and international hires.

- The committee will revise the language regarding tenure upon hire to reflect these concerns.
- Remand and Grievance Procedures: The committee will consider comments regarding remand and grievance procedures.
- Ongoing Work: The committee will continue working on the remaining four items.
- Feedback Solicitation: Senators are encouraged to provide email feedback to Melissa Broeckelman-Post regarding the handbook changes presented at this meeting.

c) Other Committee Actions:

- Faculty Matters Committee: This committee will bring a resolution addressing the board's resolution on anti-Semitism and University Policy 1201 at the next meeting.
- Nominations Committee: This committee will distribute calls for nominations for the university standing committee and the Board of Visitors.

Adjournment:

- A motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and passed by voice vote.
- The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 PM.

March 19, 2025

LIST OF ATTENDEES

120 Total Attendees

43 Senators Present: Supriya Baily, Ioannis Bellos, Alok Berry, Lee Black, Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Jamie Clark, Richard Craig, Tim Curby, Delton Daigle, John Dale, Sebahattin Demirkan, Kelly Dunne, Douglas Eyman, Daniel Garrison, Tim Gibson, Thalia Goldstein, Victoria Grady, Seth Hudson, Jessica Hurley, Melanie Knapp, Eugene Kontorovich, Kerri LaCharite, Siona Listokin, Tamara Maddox, Alexandra Masterson, Alexander Monea, Valerie Olmo, Bob Osgood, Anna Pollack, Greg Robinson, Pierre Rodgers, Ellen Rowe, Catherine Sausville, Zachary Schrag, Solon Simmons, Cristiana Stan, Debra Stroiney, Caroline Sutter, Anthony Terrell, Benoit Van Aken, Mohan Venigalla, David Wong, Jie Zhang

8 Senators Absent: Jehanzeb Cheema, Doris Davis, Kevin Dunayer, Ed Gero, Aditya Johri, Laurie Miller, ThanhVu Nguyen, Abbas Zaidi

4 Ex-officio Senators Present: Ann Ardis, Anne Osterman, Ken Walsh, Gregory Washington

73 Guests Present: Christopher Ackerman, Wayne Adams, Armand Alacbay, Paul Allvin, Elizabeth Alman, Elizabeth Alman, Jamilah Anderson, LaShonda Anthony, James Antony, Jaimie Appleton, Sharnnia Artis, Dominique Banville, Heidi Blackburn, Chrishon Blackwell, Tom Bluestein, Lisa Breglia, Alecia Bryan, Crystal Buckley, Jenny Chism, Taylor Crickenberger, Janet Dandridge, Brian Davis, Fatou Diouf, Gesele Durham, Kim Eby, Stacey Ellis, Ibrahim Eren, Teresa Finn, Kimberly Ford, Renate Guilford, Pallavi Gullo, Tamara Harvey, Renady Hightower, Ginny Hoy, Kevin Jackson, Vin Lacovara, Paul Liberty, Robyn Madar, Karen Manley, Andre Marshall, Doug McKenna, Kimberly Meltzer Weisman, Jenny Meslener, Janette Muir, Rene Oneal, Monica P, Thomas Polk, Cesar Rebellon, Keith Renshaw, Lauren Reuscher, Marguerite Rippey, Mohammad Salama, Michele Schwietz, Kylie Sertic, Pat Smith, Ariela Sofer, Antonio Stewart, Amira Stine, Tammy Stitz, Frank Strike, Rebecca Sutter, Bonnie Sylwester, Cathy Tompkins, Amanda Torres, Jacelyn Tyson, Preston Williams, Tricia Wilson, Elizabeth Woodley, Courtney Wooten, Andrea Zach, Ed, Jamie, Toshia

Appendices:

Documents presented and discussed at the March 19 Senate
meeting

Organization and Operations
March 19 Faculty Senate Meeting

1. Allocation of Senators for 2025-2026 (action item)
2. Proposed revisions to Faculty Senate Standing Rules (action item)
3. Proposed revisions to the Budget and Resources Committee Charge (action item)
4. Proposed revisions to the Faculty Handbook Revisions Committee Charge (action item)

Allocation for 2025-2026

School/College	2024 FTE Fulltime Faculty	Part Time Faculty	2024 FTE Total	Calculation of threshold size*	Adjusted FTE	% of total Adjusted FTE	x 49 Seats remaining	Calculated Allocation 2025-2026	Previous Allocation 2024-2025	Change
Antonin Scalia Law School	41.00	20.28	61.28	1.68	62.96	3.39%	1.66	2	2	0
College of Educ & Human Development	125.00	54.40	179.40	4.91	184.31	9.93%	4.87	5	5	+0
College of Health & Human Services	101.00	46.00	147.00	4.02	151.02	8.14%	3.99	4	4	+0
College Humanities and Social Sciences	389.00	84.18	473.18	12.96	486.14	26.19%	12.83	13	13	+0
College of Science	239.00	30.41	269.41	7.38	276.79	14.91%	7.31	7	7	+0
College of Visual & Perf Arts	91.00	53.42	144.42	3.95	148.37	7.99%	3.92	4	4	+0
Carter School	17.00	6.17	23.17	0.63				1	1	0
Costello College of Business	103.00	29.75	132.75	3.63	136.38	7.35%	3.60	4	4	+0
Schar School of Policy and Government	63.00	21.52	84.52	2.31	86.83	4.68%	2.29	2	2	-0
College of Engineering & Computing	252.00	62.82	314.82	8.62	323.44	17.42%	8.54	9	8	+1
College UN	23.00	9.66	32.66	0.89				1	1	0
			1862.61	36.52	1856.25		49.00	52	51	



STANDING RULES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

1. It shall be the responsibility of the chairs of the Senate standing committees and the chairs of university faculty standing committees to verify the continuing presence on the George Mason University faculty of all members of each committee. Committee (co)chairs shall be responsible for notifying the Chair of the Senate Committee on Nominations of any vacancies.
2. Each elected Senate standing committee and University faculty standing committee shall include members from at least three colleges or schools. Membership in University faculty standing committees are determined by the Organization and Operations Committee and should contain at least one senator.
3. Committee chairs may submit business items and reports for inclusion in the Senate agenda on behalf of their committees before the meeting agenda is posted. Senate committee chairs may also bring new business to the floor during their committee reports on behalf of their committees. Any member of the General Faculty may submit items of business for inclusion in the agenda prior to the agenda being posted. Items that are clearly aligned with the responsibilities of a specific Senate or University Standing Committee shall be referred to that committee. All other items shall be referred to the Organization and Operations Committee, which shall refer items to the committee it deems most appropriate; the Organization and Operations Committee shall report its referrals at the next regular meeting of the Senate.
4. When practical, Senate meetings shall be recorded for the convenience of the clerk and secretary in preparing minutes. These recordings, however, are to be considered temporary records for the sole purpose of creating and ascertaining the accuracy of minutes; recordings shall be deleted after the minutes of the meeting have been approved. The approved minutes—along with agendas and attachments—shall be preserved in the University Archives.

When the Rector, President, Provost, members of the Board of Visitors, or representatives of administrative offices engage with the Senate, their comments shall be transcribed in the minutes along with the question to which they are responding.
5. The Executive Committee of the Senate is composed of the Senate President, the Senate Secretary, the chairs of Faculty Senate Standing committees, and the chair of the Faculty Handbook Committee. The responsibilities of the Executive Committee are to meet

regularly with the Provost, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration, and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Development, and other members of the central administration as needed for discussion and resolution of matters raised by Senate Standing Committees and the broader faculty. The Executive Committee shall act for the Senate during the summer months, when the full Senate does not normally meet.

6. Each standing committee of the Senate shall produce an annual report at the end of the academic year that identifies accomplishments and completed tasks, a record of participation of committee members, and a list of items of business remaining unfinished. These reports should be sent to the Senate Clerk and will be published on the Faculty Senate website.

Budget & Resources Committee

Composition: The Committee shall be composed of five Senators.

Charge: The responsibilities of the Committee are:

- A. To keep the Faculty Senate and the faculty at large fully informed of all budget issues and resource allocation decisions;
- B. To provide the University's Board of Visitors, as well as its President, Provost, Deans, and Institute Directors, a faculty perspective on all budgetary issues and resource allocation decisions; and
- C. To study and review the University's facilities and support services, including the Library, and to provide the Senate recommendations for improving the existing operations.

The functions of the Committee shall include:

- A. Representing the interests of the faculty in the budgetary process and educating the faculty about University policies and procedures for developing budgets and making resource allocation decisions;
- B. Collecting, analyzing, and distributing data to enhance the transparency of all of the University's sources of funds and the allocation of said funds to achieve its Mission;
- C. Monitoring the physical facilities and auxiliary services, such as the bookstore and other concessions at the University, to assess how they can better serve the academic enterprise; and
- D. Advising the Senate on matters pertaining to the on-going improvement, development, and operation of the Library so that it can better serve the academic enterprise.
- E. Annually obtain and post the faculty salary data and any analyses that the committee may have carried out on the Faculty Senate website.

Faculty Handbook Revision Committee

(Approved by the Faculty Senate April 28, 2010; revisions approved March 2, 2022)

Committee Membership:

- Three members of the instructional faculty elected by the Faculty Senate to 3-year terms. Two faculty must be tenured and one faculty must be a term faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or higher. At least one member must be a Senator. Because the Chair will also serve on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Chair must be elected from among the Senators on the committee.

In order to maintain continuity, the faculty members of the Committee shall have staggered terms. The Chair of the committee is appointed by and from among the elected faculty members;

- A non-voting administrator appointed by the Provost from the Provost's office;
- A non-voting administrator from Human Resources appointed by the Vice President of Human Resources.

Charge:

The Committee will review the Faculty Handbook each year for potential changes. Proposed changes may also be brought to the Committee by any member of the faculty, administration, or Board of Visitors. The Committee is charged to confer with other members of the faculty and the administration during the review, as appropriate.

The Committee will present its proposed revisions to the President, Provost, and Faculty Senate for discussion. All motions to recommend alterations to the Faculty Handbook shall be read and debated at two successive regular meetings of the Senate held in the same academic year before being called to a vote. A meeting of the Senate called solely to complete the agenda of a previous meeting shall not count as a "successive" meeting. ~~at least 5 weeks before a final set of recommended revisions is presented to the Faculty Senate for a vote.~~ During a discussion meeting, the President, Provost, or Faculty Senate may recommend changes to be considered by the Committee.

The Committee will review all recommended changes.

At the meeting during which the Committee presents its final set of proposed changes, the Faculty Senate may accept or reject the proposed revisions but may not amend them. Revisions that are approved by the Faculty Senate are then presented to the Board of Visitors. All revisions require the formal approval of the Board of Visitors.

~~Any meeting where proposed revisions are presented may be a Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate.~~

Faculty Handbook Revision Committee
March 19, 2025

Second read items ready for a vote:

- [2.1.3 Term Appointments](#)
- [2.12.3 Procedures for Appointment and Renewal](#) (Department Chairs)
- [3.6.2 Leave Program for Instructional Faculty](#)

First read items (will vote on April 30)

- [2.3.2.3 Awarding of Tenure at the Time of Appointment](#)
- [2.8.5 Remand Process](#)
- [2.11.2.2 Grievance Procedures](#)
- [3.2 Salary Increases](#)

2.1.3 Term Appointments (vote)

Proposed Language

2.1.3 Term Appointments

Full-time faculty on fixed-term, non-tenure-track appointments are known as Term Faculty. Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on teaching are appointed as instructional faculty. Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on research are appointed as research faculty. Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on clinical practice are appointed as clinical faculty. While term faculty may identify with a primary focus, their assignments may include a blend of teaching, research, service, clinical practice, administrative, or leadership responsibilities that go beyond the boundaries of their primary focus. The faculty member's specific responsibilities will be stipulated in the appointment contract or assignment letter.

Instructional term faculty with a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor. Research term faculty with a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor. Clinical term faculty with a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor.

Instructional term faculty without a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Instructor, Senior Instructor, Master Instructor; or Professor of Practice. Clinical term faculty without a terminal degree may hold the rank of Clinical Instructor, Clinical Senior Instructor, or Clinical Master Instructor. Research term faculty without a terminal degree are Research Staff ([Section 2.1.6](#)).

Term faculty on single-year appointments whose permanent employment is with another organization hold title with the prefix "Visiting."

Term faculty appointment contracts are issued for a single-year or for multiple years, up to a maximum of 5 years. For initial appointments for faculty with terminal degrees, the maximum contract length for assistant professors is three years and for associate and full professors it is five years. For initial appointments for faculty without terminal degrees, the contract length is one year. If a multi-year appointment is offered to a faculty member whose position relies entirely or partially on non-state appropriated funding, then a multi-year contract may be established subject to the continuing availability of funding throughout the contract period. Exceptions to either contract length or terminal degree requirements must be approved by the Provost.

Contracts automatically expire at the end of the contract period, and although a faculty member may be reappointed ([Section 2.7.1](#)), there is no guarantee or right to reappointment from one contract to the next, whether single-year or multi-year. With the prior approval of the Provost, term faculty with the terminal degree may be considered for a tenure-track or tenured appointment as a result of a search ([Section 2.3.2.1](#)) or, rarely, by a direct appointment ([Section 2.3.2.2](#)). Service on a term appointment, whether or not externally-funded, may be applied to tenure consideration only if specified in the initial tenure-track letter of appointment.

Term faculty are eligible to be considered for promotion in rank, normally after five years of service.

Proposed Language with Track Changes

2.1.3 Term Appointments

Full-time faculty on fixed-term, non-tenure-track appointments are known as Term Faculty. Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on teaching are appointed as instructional faculty. Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on research are appointed as research faculty. Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on clinical practice are appointed as clinical faculty. While term faculty may identify with a primary focus, their assignments may include a blend of teaching, research, service, clinical practice, administrative, or leadership responsibilities that go beyond the boundaries of their primary focus. The faculty member's specific responsibilities will be stipulated in the appointment contract or assignment letter.

Instructional term faculty with a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor. Research term faculty with a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor. Clinical term faculty with a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor.

Instructional term faculty without a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Instructor, Senior Instructor, Master Instructor; or Professor of Practice. Clinical term faculty without a terminal degree may hold the rank of Clinical Instructor, Clinical Senior Instructor, or Clinical Master Instructor. Research term faculty without a terminal degree are Research Staff ([Section 2.1.6](#)).

Term faculty on single-year appointments whose permanent employment is with another organization hold title with the prefix "Visiting."

Term faculty appointment contracts are issued for a single-year or for multiple years, up to a maximum of 5 years. For initial appointments for faculty with terminal degrees, the maximum contract length for assistant professors is three years and for associate and full professors it is five years. For initial appointments for faculty without terminal degrees, the contract length is one year. If a multi-year appointment is offered to a faculty member whose position relies entirely or partially on non-state appropriated funding, then a multi-year contract may be established subject to the continuing availability of funding throughout the contract period. ~~Faculty on multi-year contracts normally hold a terminal degree, as defined by standards in the discipline.~~ Exceptions to either contract length or terminal degree requirements must be approved by the Provost.

Contracts automatically expire at the end of the contract period, and although a faculty member may be reappointed ([Section 2.7.1](#)), there is no guarantee or right to reappointment from one contract to the next, whether single-year or multi-year. With the prior approval of the Provost, term faculty with the terminal degree may be considered for a tenure-track or tenured

appointment as a result of a search ([Section 2.3.2.1](#)) or, rarely, by a direct appointment ([Section 2.3.2.2](#)). Service on a term appointment, whether or not externally-funded, may be applied to tenure consideration only if specified in the initial tenure-track letter of appointment.

Term faculty are eligible to be considered for promotion in rank, normally after five years of service.

Current Language

2.1.3 Term Appointments

Full-time faculty on fixed-term, non-tenure-track appointments are known as Term Faculty. Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on teaching are appointed as instructional faculty. Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on research are appointed as research faculty. Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on clinical practice are appointed as clinical faculty. While term faculty may identify with a primary focus, their assignments may include a blend of teaching, research, service, clinical practice, administrative, or leadership responsibilities that go beyond the boundaries of their primary focus. The faculty member's specific responsibilities will be stipulated in the appointment contract or assignment letter.

Instructional term faculty with a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor. Research term faculty with a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor. Clinical term faculty with a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor.

Instructional term faculty without a terminal degree may hold one of the following ranks: Instructor, Senior Instructor, Master Instructor; or Professor of Practice. Clinical term faculty without a terminal degree may hold the rank of Clinical Instructor, Clinical Senior Instructor, or Clinical Master Instructor. Research term faculty without a terminal degree are Research Staff ([Section 2.1.6](#)).

Term faculty on single-year appointments whose permanent employment is with another organization hold title with the prefix "Visiting."

Term faculty appointment contracts are issued for a single-year or for multiple years, up to a maximum of 5 years. For initial appointments, the maximum contract length for assistant professors is three years and for associate and full professors it is five years. If a multi-year appointment is offered to a faculty member whose position relies entirely or partially on non-state appropriated funding, then a multi-year contract may be established subject to the continuing availability of funding throughout the contract period. Faculty on multi-year contracts normally hold a terminal degree, as defined by standards in the discipline. Exceptions to either contract length or terminal degree requirements must be approved by the Provost.

Contracts automatically expire at the end of the contract period, and although a faculty member may be reappointed ([Section 2.7.1](#)), there is no guarantee or right to reappointment from one contract to the next, whether single-year or multi-year. With the prior approval of the Provost, term faculty with the terminal degree may be considered for a tenure-track or tenured appointment as a result of a search ([Section 2.3.2.1](#)) or, rarely, by a direct appointment ([Section 2.3.2.2](#)). Service on a term appointment, whether or not externally-funded, may be applied to tenure consideration only if specified in the initial tenure-track letter of appointment.

Term faculty are eligible to be considered for promotion in rank, normally after five years of service.

2.12.3 Procedures for Appointment and Renewal (vote)

Proposed Language

2.12.3 Procedures for Appointment and Renewal

2.12.3.1 Search Procedures

Search procedures are initiated after the incumbent chair has declined to seek reappointment, or after the Provost has notified the incumbent chair of the decision not to reappoint, or when the position is vacant. A search committee is constituted no later than December 10th. This committee consists of five faculty, all of whom have held a full-time instructional appointment for at least one year: (i) a chair, appointed by the Dean, from among the faculty of the college/school but not of the department; (ii) two faculty appointed by the Dean from among the faculty of the department; and (iii) two faculty elected from among and by the faculty of the department. The department elects its members of the committee after the appointments by the Dean have been made known. The four department faculty members must include at least one representative from each of the faculty groups (tenured, tenure-track, instructional term) who have appointments in the department. If the qualifications for faculty membership cannot be met, the Dean will consult with the department faculty before appointing another faculty member.

The search committee:

1. consults with the faculty of the department and other persons it deems appropriate about the qualities to be sought in a new chair;
2. seeks qualified candidates from inside or, if the Dean has given notice that external candidates can be considered, from outside the department;
3. requests dossiers, including references, from candidates outside the University, when appropriate;
4. consults regarding fair employment practices with the Office of Diversity, Ethics, and Inclusion;
5. evaluates qualifications and dossiers of candidates;
6. supervises departmental discussion of candidates and balloting to determine the wishes of the department faculty; and
7. submits to the Dean reports including a general assessment of the several candidates, a summary of departmental discussions, the results of departmental balloting, and its own recommendations.

The Dean makes a recommendation with an accompanying justification in writing to the Provost and the departmental faculty, including in that recommendation the full report of the committee. If the committee and the departmental faculty are not in agreement or if the Dean does not endorse the recommendation of a majority of the committee and/or the department faculty, the Dean meets with the committee and/or the faculty to seek committee and faculty perspectives and try to reach consensus before submitting the Dean's recommendation to the Provost.

If the committee and/or the departmental faculty and the Dean have remained in disagreement, or if the Provost does not endorse the joint recommendation of the committee and the Dean, the

Provost meets with the committee and the Dean to seek each party's perspectives and to try to reach consensus. The final decision rests with the Provost.

The Provost apprises the Dean, the search committee, and the faculty of the decision. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean extends a formal invitation to the person chosen.

If the vacancy is not filled nor an offer extended by May 1st, the Provost, after consultation with the Dean and the faculty of the department, appoints an acting chair and so notifies members of the department by July 1st.

2.12.3.2 Renewal Procedures

The Dean of the appropriate college/school writes to the incumbent chair before the last day of classes of the spring term of the academic year preceding the chair's final year of appointment. In this letter, the Dean states that the chair will be considered a candidate for reappointment unless the chair withdraws from consideration in writing before September 1st.

If the incumbent chair wishes to be a candidate for reappointment, the Dean constitutes by September 15th a committee to elicit and formulate the views of the faculty of the department. The committee is constituted according to the specifications governing the composition of the search committee described in [Section 2.12.3.1](#).

To begin the process for chair renewals, the committee consults with the department faculty and other persons it deems appropriate concerning the past performance of the chair and the desirability of the chair's renewal. The committee ascertains the will of the department faculty through an anonymous ballot and makes recommendations in writing to the Dean no later than October 15th. LAU bylaws should specify who has voting rights. The report includes the division of departmental and committee balloting by numbers only.

The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost by November 1st. The Provost decides whether or not to reappoint the incumbent chair by December 1st and promptly communicates this decision and supporting reasons in writing to the Dean, the committee, the departmental faculty, and the chair.

Proposed Language with Track Changes:

2.12.3 Procedures for Appointment and Renewal

2.12.3.1 Search Procedures

Search procedures are initiated after the incumbent chair has declined to seek reappointment, or after the Provost has notified the incumbent chair of the decision not to reappoint, or when the position is vacant. A search committee is constituted no later than December 10th. This committee consists of five faculty, all of whom have held a full-time instructional appointment for at least one year: (i) a chair, appointed by the Dean, from among the faculty of the college/school but not of the department; (ii) two faculty appointed by the Dean from among the faculty of the department; and (iii) two faculty elected from among and by the faculty of the department. The department elects its members of the committee after the appointments by the Dean have been made known. The four department faculty members must include at least one representative from each of the faculty groups (tenured, tenure-track, instructional term) who have appointments in the department. If the qualifications for faculty membership cannot be met, the Dean will consult with the department faculty before appointing another faculty member.

The search committee:

1. consults with the faculty of the department and other persons it deems appropriate about the qualities to be sought in a new chair;
2. seeks qualified candidates from inside or, if the Dean has given notice that external candidates can be considered, from outside the department;
3. requests dossiers, including references, from candidates outside the University, when appropriate;
4. consults regarding fair employment practices with the Office of Diversity, Ethics, and Inclusion;
5. evaluates qualifications and dossiers of candidates;
6. supervises departmental discussion of candidates and balloting to determine the wishes of the department faculty; and
7. submits to the Dean reports including a general assessment of the several candidates, a summary of departmental discussions, the results of departmental balloting, and its own recommendations.

The Dean makes a recommendation with an accompanying justification in writing to the Provost and the departmental faculty, including in that recommendation the full report of the committee. If the committee and the departmental faculty are not in agreement or if the Dean does not endorse the recommendation of a majority of the committee and/or the department faculty, the Dean meets with the committee and/or the faculty to seek ~~an identity of views~~committee and faculty perspectives and try to reach consensus before submitting the Dean's recommendation to the Provost.

If the committee and/or the departmental faculty and the Dean have remained in disagreement, or if the Provost does not endorse the joint recommendation of the committee and the Dean, the Provost meets with the committee and the Dean to seek ~~an identity of view~~each party's perspectives and to try to reach consensus. The final decision rests with the Provost.

The Provost appries the Dean, the search committee, and the faculty of the decision. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean extends a formal invitation to the person chosen.

If the vacancy is not filled nor an offer extended by May 1st, the Provost, after consultation with the Dean and the faculty of the department, appoints an acting chair and so notifies members of the department by July 1st.

2.12.3.2 Renewal Procedures

The Dean of the appropriate college/school writes to the incumbent chair before the last day of classes of the spring term of the academic year preceding the chair's final year of appointment. In this letter, the Dean states that the chair will be considered a candidate for reappointment unless the chair withdraws from consideration in writing before September 1st.

If the incumbent chair wishes to be a candidate for reappointment, the Dean constitutes by September 15th a committee to elicit and formulate the views of the faculty of the department. The committee is constituted according to the specifications governing the composition of the search committee described in [Section 2.12.3.1](#).

To begin the process for chair renewals, the committee consults with the department faculty and other persons it deems appropriate concerning the past performance of the chair and the desirability of the chair's renewal. The committee ascertains the will of the department faculty through an anonymous ballot and makes recommendations in writing to the Dean no later than October 15th. LAU bylaws should specify who has voting rights. The report includes the division of departmental and committee balloting by numbers only.

The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost by November 1st. The Provost decides whether or not to reappoint the incumbent chair by December 1st and promptly communicates this decision and supporting reasons in writing to the Dean, the committee, the departmental faculty, and the chair.

2.12.3 Procedures for Appointment and Renewal

2.12.3.1 Search Procedures

Search procedures are initiated after the incumbent chair has declined to seek reappointment, or after the Provost has notified the incumbent chair of the decision not to reappoint, or when the position is vacant. A search committee is constituted no later than December 10th. This committee consists of five faculty, all of whom have held a full-time instructional appointment for at least one year: (i) a chair, appointed by the Dean, from among the faculty of the college/school but not of the department; (ii) two faculty appointed by the Dean from among the faculty of the department; and (iii) two faculty elected from among and by the faculty of the department. The department elects its members of the committee after the appointments by the Dean have been made known. The four department faculty members must include at least one representative from each of the faculty groups (tenured, tenure-track, instructional term) who have appointments in the department. If the qualifications for faculty membership cannot be met, the Dean will consult with the department faculty before appointing another faculty member.

The search committee:

1. consults with the faculty of the department and other persons it deems appropriate about the qualities to be sought in a new chair;
2. seeks qualified candidates from inside or, if the Dean has given notice that external candidates can be considered, from outside the department;
3. requests dossiers, including references, from candidates outside the University, when appropriate;
4. consults regarding fair employment practices with the Office of Diversity, Ethics, and Inclusion;
5. evaluates qualifications and dossiers of candidates;
6. supervises departmental discussion of candidates and balloting to determine the wishes of the department faculty; and
7. submits to the Dean reports including a general assessment of the several candidates, a summary of departmental discussions, the results of departmental balloting, and its own recommendations.

The Dean makes a recommendation with an accompanying justification in writing to the Provost and the departmental faculty, including in that recommendation the full report of the committee. If the committee and the departmental faculty are not in agreement or if the Dean does not endorse the recommendation of a majority of the committee and/or the department faculty, the Dean meets with the committee and/or the faculty to seek an identity of views before submitting the recommendation to the Provost.

If the committee and/or the departmental faculty and the Dean have remained in disagreement or if the Provost does not endorse the joint recommendation of the committee and the Dean, the Provost meets with the committee and the Dean to seek an identity of view.

The Provost apprises the Dean, the search committee, and the faculty of the decision. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean extends a formal invitation to the person chosen.

If the vacancy is not filled nor an offer extended by May 1st, the Provost, after consultation with the Dean and the faculty of the department, appoints an acting chair and so notifies members of the department by July 1st.

2.12.3.2 Renewal Procedures

The Dean of the appropriate college/school writes to the incumbent chair before the last day of classes of the spring term of the academic year preceding the chair's final year of appointment. In this letter, the Dean states that the chair will be considered a candidate for reappointment unless the chair withdraws from consideration in writing before September 1st.

If the incumbent chair wishes to be a candidate for reappointment, the Dean constitutes by September 15th a committee to elicit and formulate the views of the faculty of the department. The committee is constituted according to the specifications governing the composition of the search committee described in [Section 2.12.3.1](#).

The committee consults with the department faculty and other persons it deems appropriate concerning the past performance of the chair and the desirability of the chair's renewal. The committee ascertains the will of the department faculty and makes recommendations in writing to the Dean no later than October 15th. The report includes the division of departmental and committee balloting by numbers only.

The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost by November 1st. The Provost decides whether or not to reappoint the incumbent chair by December 1st and promptly communicates this decision and supporting reasons in writing to the Dean, the committee, the departmental faculty, and the chair.

3.6.2 Leave Program for Instructional Faculty (vote)

Proposed Language

3.6.2 Leave Program for Instructional Faculty

The purpose of this leave program is to support professional development initiatives designed to advance scholarly research, teaching, and/or creative activity, including the development of innovative teaching approaches and methods. Leaves are for one semester at full pay and full benefits or an academic year at half pay with full benefits (based on 50% of base salary).

Faculty must be tenured or on a term multi-year contract, with six years of service at Mason, and have completed six years of such service since a previous study leave (not including tenure-track study leaves, see 3.6.1). This six-year period includes time spent on leave of absence, unless such leave includes time worked at another agency or institution, in which case an exception must be approved and granted by the Vice President for Research.

Colleges and schools establish and publish the procedures, criteria and deadlines for submission and review of leave proposals. The timing of a leave may be delayed if in the judgment of the LAU administrator, the faculty member's services are needed for a particular semester. Colleges and schools will notify the Provost of those faculty who have been approved for a study leave.

A faculty member who receives a study leave must agree to remain a full-time employee of the University for at least one academic year after the conclusion of the leave.

A faculty member who accepts a study leave must agree to serve as a reviewer of future applications at least once.

Proposed Language with Track Changes

3.6.2 Leave Program for Instructional Faculty

The purpose of this leave program is to support professional development initiatives designed to advance scholarly research, teaching, and/or creative activity, including the development of innovative teaching approaches and methods. Leaves are for one semester at full pay and full benefits or an academic year at half pay with full benefits (based on 50% of base salary).

Faculty must be tenured or on a term multi-year contract, with six years of service at Mason, and have completed six years of such service since a previous study leave (**not including tenure-track study leaves, see 3.6.1**). This six-year period includes time spent on leave of absence, unless such leave includes time worked at another agency or institution, in which case an exception must be approved and granted by the Vice President for Research.

Colleges and schools establish **and publish** the procedures, criteria and deadlines for submission and review of leave proposals. The timing of a leave may be delayed if in the judgment of the LAU administrator, the faculty member's services are needed for a particular semester. Colleges and schools will notify the Provost of those faculty who have been approved for a study leave.

A faculty member who receives a study leave must agree to remain a full-time employee of the University for at least one academic year after the conclusion of the leave.

A faculty member who accepts a study leave must agree to serve as a reviewer of future applications at least once.

Current Language

3.6.2 Leave Program for Instructional Faculty

The purpose of this leave program is to support professional development initiatives designed to advance scholarly research, teaching, and/or creative activity, including the development of innovative teaching approaches and methods. Leaves are for one semester at full pay and full benefits or an academic year at half pay with full benefits (based on 50% of base salary).

Faculty must be tenured or on a term multi-year contract, with six years of service at Mason, and have completed six years of such service since a previous study leave. This six-year period includes time spent on leave of absence, unless such leave includes time worked at another agency or institution, in which case an exception must be approved and granted by the Vice President for Research.

Colleges and schools establish the procedures, criteria and deadlines for submission and review of leave proposals. The timing of a leave may be delayed if in the judgment of the LAU administrator, the faculty member's services are needed for a particular semester. Colleges and schools will notify the Provost of those faculty who have been approved for a study leave.

A faculty member who receives a study leave must agree to remain a full-time employee of the University for at least one academic year after the conclusion of the leave.

A faculty member who accepts a study leave must agree to serve as a reviewer of future applications at least once.

2.3.2.3 Awarding of Tenure at the Time of Appointment (first read)

Proposed Language

2.3.2.3 Awarding of Tenure at the Time of Appointment

If a candidate is to be appointed without term, the appointment procedure is conducted as specified for competitive ([SECTION 2.3.2.1](#)) or non-competitive ([SECTION 2.3.2.2](#)) appointments. Following an affirmative decision to appoint, the eligible faculty consider whether to recommend tenure in a first-level review in conformance with [SECTION 2.7.3](#) Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.

The recommendation is then sent to the second-level college/school promotion and tenure committee.

For faculty who earned tenure at their prior institution and are being hired at the same rank that they previously held, tenure at time of appointment will be considered through an expedited process that will rely primarily on materials that were submitted as part of the hiring process. Such dossiers shall include the cover letter that was submitted as part of the job application; a comprehensive CV that includes an employment chronology and a comprehensive summary of teaching, scholarly work, and service activity; and a detailed reference list that includes references who can speak to the candidate's prior work and scholarly reputation in their discipline. Candidates may also add supplemental materials to their dossier to add further evidence that they meet the criteria for promotion and tenure, at their discretion.

Candidates are held to the same standards as other candidates in that LAU. Since such appointments may be made outside the normal annual promotion and tenure cycle, college/school promotion and tenure committees must establish and follow procedures for promptly reviewing candidates out of cycle.

Proposed Language with Track Changes

2.3.2.3 Awarding of Tenure at the Time of Appointment

If a candidate is to be appointed without term, the appointment procedure is conducted as specified for competitive ([SECTION 2.3.2.1](#)) or non-competitive ([SECTION 2.3.2.2](#)) appointments. Following an affirmative decision to appoint, the eligible faculty consider whether to recommend tenure in a first-level review in conformance with [SECTION 2.7.3](#) Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.

The recommendation is then sent to the second-level college/school promotion and tenure committee.

For faculty who earned tenure at their prior institution and are being hired at the same rank that they previously held, tenure at time of appointment will be considered through an expedited process that will rely primarily on materials that were submitted as part of the hiring process. Such dossiers shall include the cover letter that was submitted as part of the job application; a comprehensive CV that includes an employment chronology and a comprehensive summary of

teaching, scholarly work, and service activity; and a detailed reference list that includes references who can speak to the candidate's prior work and scholarly reputation in their discipline. Candidates may also add supplemental materials to their dossier to add further evidence that they meet the criteria for promotion and tenure, at their discretion.

~~eligible on the promotion and tenure committee of.~~ Independent external letters from recognized experts in the candidate's field must be obtained in a manner consistent with other tenure reviews, and eCandidates are held to the same standards as other candidates in that LAU. Since such appointments may be made outside the normal annual promotion and tenure cycle, college/school promotion and tenure committees must establish and follow procedures for promptly reviewing candidates out of cycle.

Current Language

2.3.2.3 Awarding of Tenure at the Time of Appointment

If a candidate is to be appointed without term, the appointment procedure is conducted as specified for competitive ([SECTION 2.3.2.1](#)) or non-competitive ([SECTION 2.3.2.2](#)) appointments. Following an affirmative decision to appoint, the eligible faculty consider whether to recommend tenure in a first-level review in conformance with [SECTION 2.7.3](#) Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.

The recommendation is then sent to the second-level college/school promotion and tenure committee. Independent external letters from recognized experts in the candidate's field must be obtained in a manner consistent with other tenure reviews, and candidates are held to the same standards as other candidates in that LAU. Since such appointments may be made outside the normal annual promotion and tenure cycle, college/school promotion and tenure committees must establish and follow procedures for promptly reviewing candidates out of cycle.

2.8.5 Remand Process (first read)

Proposed Language

2.8.5 Remand Process

If the UPTRAC determines by majority vote that the appeal has sufficient merit, then the UPTRAC remands the case to the lowest level at which the grounds for appeal was based or to the first-level review committee if the grounds for appeal is based on Substantial New Evidence ([Section 2.8.1](#)). At that level and each subsequent level specified in [Section 2.7.3](#) (or in the case of renewal, [Section 2.7.2](#)), the case shall be evaluated by the designated bodies as they are constituted at the time of the remand, and by the individuals holding the relevant administrative positions at the time of the remand. At each level, a recommendation should normally be completed within fourteen calendar days and forwarded to the next level. The reason for the UPTRAC remand must be explicitly addressed in the recommendation at each level. No case may be remanded more than once.

If the President believes that promotion or tenure should be granted, the recommendation is submitted to the Board of Visitors for final action. If the President decides that renewal should be granted, the decision is final. If the President decides renewal, promotion or tenure should not be granted, the decision is final and there is no further appeal.

At each level of review in the remand process, if a recommendation or decision is negative, a clear, written justification is sent concurrently to the appellant, to the local academic unit, and to the next level of review.

Proposed Language with Track Changes

2.8.5 Remand Process

If the UPTRAC determines by majority vote that the appeal has sufficient merit, then the UPTRAC remands the case to the lowest level at which the grounds for appeal was based or to the first-level review committee if the grounds for appeal is based on Substantial New Evidence ([Section 2.8.1](#)). At that level and each subsequent level specified in [Section 2.7.3](#) (or in the case of renewal, [Section 2.7.2](#)), the case shall be evaluated by the designated bodies as they are constituted at the time of the remand, and by the individuals holding the relevant administrative positions at the time of the remand. At each level, a recommendation should normally be completed within fourteen calendar days and forwarded to the next level. The ~~reason for the ease~~ ~~file submitted by the~~ UPTRAC ~~remand~~ must be explicitly addressed in the recommendation at each level. No case may be remanded more than once.

If the President believes that promotion or tenure should be granted, the recommendation is submitted to the Board of Visitors for final action. If the President decides that renewal should be granted, the decision is final. If the President decides renewal, promotion or tenure should not be granted, the decision is final and there is no further appeal.

At each level of review in the remand process, if a recommendation or decision is negative, a clear, written justification is sent concurrently to the appellant, to the local academic unit, and to the next level of review.

Current Language

2.8.5 Remand Process

If the UPTRAC determines by majority vote that the appeal has sufficient merit, then the UPTRAC remands the case to the lowest level at which the grounds for appeal was based or to the first-level review committee if the grounds for appeal is based on Substantial New Evidence ([SECTION 2.8.1](#)). At that level and each subsequent level specified in [SECTION 2.7.3](#) (or in the case of renewal, [SECTION 2.7.2](#)), the case shall be evaluated by the designated bodies as they are constituted at the time of the remand, and by the individuals holding the relevant administrative positions at the time of the remand. At each level, a recommendation should normally be completed within fourteen calendar days and forwarded to the next level. The case file submitted by the UPTRAC must be explicitly addressed in the recommendation at each level. No case may be remanded more than once.

If the President believes that promotion or tenure should be granted, the recommendation is submitted to the Board of Visitors for final action. If the President decides that renewal should be granted, the decision is final. If the President decides renewal, promotion or tenure should not be granted, the decision is final and there is no further appeal.

At each level of review in the remand process, if a recommendation or decision is negative, a clear, written justification is sent concurrently to the appellant, to the local academic unit, and to the next level of review.

2.11.2.2 Grievance Procedures (first read)

Proposed Language

2.11.2.2 Grievance Procedures

1. Grievance procedures for all Grievance Committees must adhere to the following basic elements.
 - a. The faculty member initiates a grievance by filing a written statement of the grievance, along with supporting documentation, with the Chair of the relevant grievance committee. No grievance may be heard on behalf of a third party or group.
 - b. Before the grievance itself is considered, the committee must conclude that the petitioner's case appears to have merit.
 - c. The faculty member may withdraw the grievance at any time without the grievance committee's approval. In such case, the grievance committee will not make a decision or recommendation.
 - d. No member of the committee with a conflict of interest in the grievance case may participate in the proceedings.
 - e. Committees are particularly charged to be alert to instances of inequitable treatment and retaliation against colleagues who have filed grievances.
2. Within a college/school, grievances against fellow faculty members and academic administrators below the level of Dean are heard by the local grievance committee.
 - a. If the grievance is against a fellow faculty member, the committee is charged to investigate the facts of the case and determine an appropriate resolution. The grievance committee's decision is final.
 - b. If the grievance is against an academic administrator below the level of Dean, the committee is charged to investigate the facts of the case and to recommend a resolution, which is then forwarded to the Dean, whose decision is final.
3. Grievances against academic administrators at or above the level of Dean are heard by the University Grievance Committee.
 - a. If the grievance is against a Dean, the committee's recommendation is forwarded to the Provost, whose decision is final.
 - b. If the grievance is against the Provost, the committee's recommendation is forwarded to the President, whose decision is final.
 - c. If the grievance is against the President, the committee's recommendation is forwarded to the Rector of the Board of Visitors, whose decision is final.

Proposed Language with Track Changes

2.11.2.2 Grievance Procedures

1. Grievance procedures for all Grievance Committees must adhere to the following basic elements.
 - a. The faculty member initiates a grievance by filing a written statement of the grievance, along with supporting documentation, with the Chair of the relevant grievance committee. No grievance may be heard on behalf of a third party or group.
 - b. Before the grievance itself is considered, the committee must conclude that the petitioner's case appears to have merit.
 - c. The faculty member may withdraw the grievance at any time without the grievance committee's approval. In such case, the grievance committee will not make a decision or recommendation.
 - d. No member of the committee with a conflict of interest in the grievance case may participate in the proceedings.
 - e. Committees are particularly charged to be alert to instances of inequitable treatment and retaliation against colleagues who have filed grievances.

2. Within a college/school, grievances against fellow faculty members and academic administrators below the level of Dean are heard by the local grievance committee.
 - a. If the grievance is against a fellow faculty member, the committee is charged to investigate the facts of the case and determine an appropriate resolution. The grievance committee's decision is final.
 - b. If the grievance is against an academic administrator below the level of Dean, the committee is charged to investigate the facts of the case and to recommend a resolution, which is then forwarded to the Dean, whose decision is final.
 - ~~c. In cases of alleged violations of academic freedom, the faculty of the college/school acts on its grievance committee's recommendation by formal vote, the outcome of which is final.~~

3. Grievances against academic administrators at or above the level of Dean are heard by the University Grievance Committee.
 - a. If the grievance is against a Dean, the committee's recommendation is forwarded to the Provost, whose decision is final.
 - b. If the grievance is against the Provost, the committee's recommendation is forwarded to the President, whose decision is final.
 - c. If the grievance is against the President, the committee's recommendation is forwarded to the Rector of the Board of Visitors, whose decision is final.

Current Language

2.11.2.2 Grievance Procedures

1. Grievance procedures for all Grievance Committees must adhere to the following basic elements.
 - a. The faculty member initiates a grievance by filing a written statement of the grievance, along with supporting documentation, with the Chair of the relevant grievance committee. No grievance may be heard on behalf of a third party or group.
 - b. Before the grievance itself is considered, the committee must conclude that the petitioner's case appears to have merit.
 - c. The faculty member may withdraw the grievance at any time without the grievance committee's approval. In such case, the grievance committee will not make a decision or recommendation.
 - d. No member of the committee with a conflict of interest in the grievance case may participate in the proceedings.
 - e. Committees are particularly charged to be alert to instances of inequitable treatment and retaliation against colleagues who have filed grievances.
2. Within a college/school, grievances against fellow faculty members and academic administrators below the level of Dean are heard by the local grievance committee.
 - a. If the grievance is against a fellow faculty member, the committee is charged to investigate the facts of the case and determine an appropriate resolution. The grievance committee's decision is final.
 - b. If the grievance is against an academic administrator below the level of Dean, the committee is charged to investigate the facts of the case and to recommend a resolution, which is then forwarded to the Dean, whose decision is final.
 - c. In cases of alleged violations of academic freedom, the faculty of the college/school acts on its grievance committee's recommendation by formal vote, the outcome of which is final.
3. Grievances against academic administrators at or above the level of Dean are heard by the University Grievance Committee.
 - a. If the grievance is against a Dean, the committee's recommendation is forwarded to the Provost, whose decision is final.
 - b. If the grievance is against the Provost, the committee's recommendation is forwarded to the President, whose decision is final.
 - c. If the grievance is against the President, the committee's recommendation is forwarded to the Rector of the Board of Visitors, whose decision is final.

3.2 Salary Increases (first read)

Proposed Language

3.2 Salary Increases

Subject to the availability of funding, salary increases are given annually and are based chiefly on performance. All faculty with an overall satisfactory annual evaluation (see [SECTION 2.6.1](#)) will receive at least a minimum salary increment. Salary increases may also reflect efforts to achieve equity. In the case that funding from the state is designated as a cost-of-living adjustment, it is the responsibility of the University to ensure such funds are disbursed accordingly.

Each college or school shall have a policy or documented process in place for determining and communicating merit-based salary increases or shall ensure that each of its local academic units have such policies and processes. Annual evaluations shall be the primary basis for determining merit-based salary increases. Local unit administrators will include the faculty member's performance evaluations over multiple years in making a recommendation if salary adjustments were not made in the preceding year(s).

The salary recommendation, including a justification and the amount of the increase, will be given to the faculty member in writing at the time it is transmitted to the next level.

Faculty members who are dissatisfied with a salary increase normally seek recourse within their local academic unit. If dissatisfaction persists, grievance procedures outlined in [SECTION 2.11.2](#) may be followed.

Proposed Language with Track Changes

3.2 Salary Increases

Subject to the availability of funding, salary increases are given annually and are based chiefly on performance. All faculty with an overall satisfactory annual evaluation (see [SECTION 2.6.1](#)) will receive at least a minimum salary increment. Salary increases may also reflect efforts to achieve equity. In the case that funding from the state is designated as a cost-of-living adjustment, it is the responsibility of the University to ensure such funds are disbursed accordingly.

Each college or school shall have a policy or documented process in place for determining and communicating merit-based salary increases or shall ensure that each of its local academic units have such policies and processes. ~~Because~~ Annual evaluations ~~shall be~~ the primary basis for determining merit-based salary increases. ~~Local~~ Local unit administrators will include the faculty member's performance evaluations over multiple years in making a recommendation if salary adjustments were not made in the preceding year(s).

The salary recommendation, including a justification and the amount of the increase, will be given to the faculty member in writing at the time it is transmitted to the next level.

Faculty members who are dissatisfied with a salary increase normally seek recourse within their local academic unit. If dissatisfaction persists, grievance procedures outlined in [SECTION 2.11.2](#) may be followed.

Current Language

3.2 Salary Increases

Subject to the availability of funding, salary increases are given annually and are based chiefly on performance. All faculty with an overall satisfactory annual evaluation (see [SECTION 2.6.1](#)) will receive at least a minimum salary increment. Salary increases may also reflect efforts to achieve equity. In the case that funding from the state is designated as a cost-of-living adjustment, it is the responsibility of the University to ensure such funds are disbursed accordingly.

Because annual evaluations are the primary basis for determining merit-based salary increases, local unit administrators will include the faculty member's performance evaluations over multiple years in making a recommendation if salary adjustments were not made in the preceding year(s).

The salary recommendation, including a justification and the amount of the increase, will be given to the faculty member in writing at the time it is transmitted to the next level.

Faculty members who are dissatisfied with a salary increase normally seek recourse within their local academic unit. If dissatisfaction persists, grievance procedures outlined in [SECTION 2.11.2](#) may be followed.