

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING

April 2, 2025, 3:00-4:15 p.m. | Online Meeting

Number of Attendees: 118 ([List of Names](#))

1. Call to Order and Opening Remarks (Solon Simmons)

- The meeting was called to order at 3:02 PM.
- Solon Simmons welcomed everyone to the first of two Faculty Senate meetings in April.
- He acknowledged the busy and difficult times, noting global events and troubling situations at other universities impacting students and faculty.
- He mentioned his participation in a retreat at the Carter School, discussing the school's potential involvement in national politics.

2. Approval of Minutes from March 19

- Zachary Schrag inquired about the posting of the minutes.
- Mohan Venigalla moved to postpone the approval of minutes until the next meeting.
- Melissa Broeckelman-Post seconded the motion.
- Solon Simmons noted the late posting and agreed to postpone the approval to the next meeting.

3. Remarks (Solon Simmons)

- Solon Simmons emphasized the importance of the Board of Visitors and encouraged faculty to volunteer for service.
- He highlighted the limited time available to address the board and the value of faculty input.
- He reported on a productive training session for the Board of Visitors focused on governance, risk, continuity, and participation, where he emphasized the role of the Faculty Senate, students, and staff.
- He acknowledged the Faculty Senate's past influence on the board, citing Melissa Broeckelman-Post and Shannon Davis's involvement.
- He suggested that the Senate might face calls to act in ways not typical of past senates and noted that this would be discussed during the meeting.
- He assured the senators that the chairs of the standing committees are aware of and concerned about these issues, which are top of mind.

4. Academic Policies (Doug Eyman)

- Doug Eyman introduced the agenda for Academic Policies, accessible through the chat.
 - **4.1 AP 1.3.4 Repeating a Course**
 - Doug Eyman explained that the updated policy clarifies the process for repeating courses for both undergraduate and graduate levels.
 - The revision separates undergraduate and graduate specifics and incorporates input from the Graduate Council, Registrar, and Financial Aid.
 - Tim Curby raised a question about courses with the same number but different content.
 - Doug Eyman clarified that the policy applies to repeating courses not designated as repeatable for credit (e.g., special topics). Repeatable courses have their limits specified in the catalog.
 - Solon Simmons confirmed that repeating the same number for different classes would require a special appeal if it's not a designated topics course.
 - **Motion:** To adopt the new language for policy 1.3.4.
 - **Vote:** The motion passed by voice vote (ayes).
 - **4.2 AP 1.4.4 Graduate Course Enrollment by Undergraduates**
 - Doug Eyman explained that this updated policy clarifies the process for advanced undergraduates to enroll in graduate courses not available at the undergraduate level.
 - He emphasized that this policy does not apply to BAM program students, who have separate requirements.
 - The policy outlines the form and process for undergraduate enrollment in such graduate courses.
 - **Motion:** To adopt the new language for policy 1.4.4.
 - **Vote:** The motion passed by voice vote (ayes).
 - **4.3 AP 2.5 Course Syllabi**
 - Doug Eyman introduced a proposed addition to the policy requiring a statement about allowable and prohibited uses of AI tools with as much specificity as possible.

- He noted that this was in response to student requests and discussions within the AI Task Force, which opted not to create policy.
- Melissa Broeckelman-Post proposed an amendment to also require a list of assignments and deadlines on the syllabus to provide clarity for students and reduce appeals.
- Kerri LaCharite seconded the amendment.
- **Discussion on the Amendment:**
 - Zachary Schrag raised concerns about the applicability to graduate courses, where flexibility may be needed.
 - Melissa Broeckelman-Post suggested the language could accommodate flexibility by allowing faculty to state that deadlines are flexible.
 - Jamie L Clark questioned how pop quizzes would be included.
 - Tamara Maddox expressed concerns about requiring every small assignment and deadline, which could limit flexibility.
 - Jamie L Clark proposed tabling the amendment for further consultation.
 - Melissa Broeckelman-Post suggested voting down the amendment and referring the issue to the committee.
 - John Dale suggested that flexibility could be built into the syllabus language.
 - Alexander Monea proposed limiting the requirement to major assignments (e.g., worth 10% or more of the final grade).
 - Tim Gibson clarified the procedural status, noting the vote was on the amendment.
 - Melissa Broeckelman-Post reiterated that a "no" vote would reject the amendment, allowing a vote on the original AI policy proposal.
- **Vote on the Amendment:** The amendment to include a list of assignments and deadlines failed by ballot vote (7 yes, 26 no).
- **Vote on the Original Motion (AI Language):**
 - John Dale sought clarification on whether the university would provide specific language for the AI statement.

- Doug Eyman clarified that the Stern Center has suggested language, but faculty have the autonomy to determine their own policies regarding AI use in their courses.
 - **Motion:** To add the language regarding AI tools to policy 2.5.
 - **Vote:** The motion passed by voice vote (ayes).
- **4.4 Enrolling for Credit Without Grade Points, Satisfactory/No Credit**
 - Doug Eyman proposed removing the line "S/NC grading will also be used for course number 998 and 999" as it is irrelevant to the policy, which concerns student-elected S/NC grading for courses outside their program.
 - Zachary Schrag expressed concern that removing the line might be confusing for graduate students receiving an "S" in required courses.
 - Doug Eyman clarified that students cannot elect S/NC for program courses or dissertation credits (998/999), which are automatically graded S/NC. The policy applies to elective courses outside their program.
 - Zachary Schrag proposed an amendment to clarify: "Graduate students may elect this option only for courses that do not apply to *their* degree or certificate requirements."
 - John Dale seconded the amendment.
 - **Discussion on the Amendment:** The discussion focused on ensuring the language clearly specifies the student's specific degree program.
 - **Motion to Amend:** To change the language to "Graduate students may elect this option only for courses that do not apply to their degree or certificate requirements."
 - **Vote on the Amendment:** The motion to amend passed by voice vote (ayes).
 - **Motion on the Main Policy (as amended):** To remove the irrelevant line and adopt the clarified language regarding graduate student SNC elections.
 - **Vote on the Main Policy:** The motion passed by voice vote (ayes).
- Attendees were reminded to complete the coach survey by April 7th.

2. Budget and Resources (Supriya Baily, Victoria Grady)

- The Budget Executive Committee continues to meet.

- Committee members encouraged attendees to review meeting slides and the scope of work on the website.
- Attendees were asked to direct any questions to Dell, Supriya, or Victoria.

3. Faculty Matters (Mohan Venigalla)

- **Faculty Evaluation of Administrators (FEA):**
 - The FEA survey will be distributed around April 15th, following the coach survey.
 - The survey is being administered by Gallup.
 - A communique will explain why chair evaluation data has not been shared.
 - The chair's data will be included in the new survey.
- **Policy 1201 (Draft Resolution):**
 - A draft resolution regarding University Policy 1201 was presented.
 - The resolution addresses academic freedom and includes language related to anti-Semitism.
 - The resolution proposes:
 - Removing a sentence and replacing it with language referencing the Office of Access Compliance.
 - Extending protection to Jewish, Israeli, Muslim, Arab, Sikh, South Asian, Hindu, and Palestinian communities.
 - Including faculty in cases involving academic freedom.
 - It was announced that the motion to support the FMC resolution passed with 33 votes in favor out of 36 responses (the final tally was 34 in favor out of 37 responses.)

4. Nominations (Richard T Craig)

- A reminder was issued for nominations to the Board of Visitors positions and a position with the Board of Trustees for the humanity foundation.
- The deadline for nominations is tomorrow evening at 5 p.m.

5. Faculty Salary Data (Solon Simmons, Delton Daigle)

- Mohan Venigalla inquired about the availability of faculty salary data.
- Delton Daigle indicated the data would be sent this afternoon.

6. Organization and Operations (Catherine Sausville, Melissa Broeckelman-Post)

- Senate allocation letters were sent to all academic units.
- Unit elections should be completed by April 15th.

- The last Senate meeting of the year (April 30th) will include the election of the Senate president.
- Nominations for president will be made from the floor.
- Candidates may share statements in advance.

7. Old and New Business (O&O):

- **Graduate Grading Task Force:** Douglas Eyman reported that the Graduate Council requested a graduate-specific version in response to the current grading task force. O&O has worked to craft a charge but will wait for the current task force's findings before proceeding.
- **Faculty Matters:** Melissa Broeckelman-Post announced that feedback has been received from Faculty Matters, and an updated charge and composition will be discussed at the next O&O meeting and likely be brought to the last meeting.
- **Admissions Committee:** Melissa Broeckelman-Post stated that Zach is working with admissions on a revised charge for the Admissions Committee, which has become less active. More information will follow.

8. Faculty Handbook Committee Report:

- **Voting Issues:** Melissa Broeckelman-Post provided context, noting that a first read of four items occurred at the last meeting. Two items with no discussion or feedback were brought for a vote. Due to the change in charge allowing for two consecutive meetings, the other two items will be discussed at the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee meeting on April 17th and brought to the Senate meeting on April 30th.
- **Timeline Implications:** Melissa Broeckelman-Post highlighted that due to a change in the Board's meeting schedule, anything approved today and the three items approved at the last meeting will go to the APDUC agenda and then to the Board for a vote on inclusion in the upcoming faculty handbook. Items voted on after today will likely not go to the Board until the September meeting and potentially the subsequent faculty handbook, unless the Board allows for an amended handbook.
- **Feedback on Tenure at Time of Appointment and Salary Increases:** Melissa Broeckelman-Post requested continued feedback on the awarding of tenure at the time of appointment and salary increases, noting that some emails with feedback have already been received. This feedback will be taken to the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee.
- **Vote on Remand Process:** Melissa Broeckelman-Post presented the proposed change to the remand process: changing "the case files submitted by UPTRAC must be" to "the reason for the UPTRAC remand must be explicitly addressed."
 - **Motion:** To approve the change to the remand process language.

- **Vote:** Voice vote. In favor: Aye (unanimous). Opposed: None.
 - **Result:** The motion passed.
- **Vote on Grievance Procedures:** Melissa Broeckelman-Post explained the proposed change to remove the separate process for alleged violations of academic freedom, aligning it procedurally with other grievances at the college or school level (as it is at the university level).
 - **Motion:** To approve the change to the grievance procedures.
 - **Vote:** Voice vote. In favor: Aye (unanimous). Opposed: None.
 - **Result:** The motion passed.
- **Discussion on Tenure at Time of Appointment:** Melissa Broeckelman-Post opened the floor for comments on the proposed streamlining procedure for tenure at the time of appointment for senior faculty hires who already held the same rank and tenure at their prior institution. This involves using their application dossier (with the option to add more materials) and going through the standard voting processes, potentially omitting external review letters in these specific cases. Comments from the previous meeting included explicitly requiring search committees to consider only candidates meeting the criteria and ensuring references are akin to external review letters from the start. This item will be discussed at the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee meeting on April 17th and will likely go to the Board in September for potential inclusion in the following year's handbook.
- **Discussion on Salary Increases:** Melissa Broeckelman-Post noted a minor proposed change to the language regarding salary increases, replacing "must" with "shall" in the context of communicating the procedure for merit-based raises. This will also be discussed in committee.

9. Comments for the Good of the Faculty:

- **Board Service:** Vin Lacovara encouraged faculty to consider serving on the board, emphasizing it as an opportunity to interact with the board, express faculty views, and ensure the faculty perspective is heard alongside the AP perspective.
- **Faculty Matters Resolution:** Mohan Venigalla thanked the Faculty Matters committee members (Zachary, Tim, and Bethany) for their work on a resolution that passed smoothly.
- **New Mason Corps Committee Elections:** Keith Renshaw raised the issue of waiving the bylaw requiring the election of committee members in the first fall meeting to allow for elections of New Mason Corps committee members in the final spring meeting for continuity and training. Melissa Broeckelman-Post clarified that the goal is to conduct nominations and elections for all Senate and university

committees by the April 15th deadline for senator election results, making a motion unnecessary at this time.

- **Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee Vacancies:** Mohan Venigalla requested that vacancies in the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee be filled at the next meeting to ensure continuity over the summer, suggesting current members whose terms are ending could be re-elected. Richard T Craig clarified that the call for nominations for university standing committees would result in appointments by August 1st for the fall. Mohan Venigalla requested that the nominations call include these specific Senate committee vacancies.

10. Adjournment:

- **Motion to Adjourn:** Solon Simmons
- **Seconded:** Kevin Dunayer
- **Vote:** Voice vote. In favor: Aye (unanimous). Opposed: None.
- **Result:** The meeting adjourned at 4:16 PM EDT.

Action Items:

- Melissa Broeckelman-Post will take the feedback on tenure at the time of appointment and salary increases to the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee meeting on April 17th.
- Nominations Committee to include vacancies for the Senate Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee in the upcoming call for nominations.
- Kerri LaCharite will send Solon Simmons the ballot sheets with numbers, potentially on the following day.

Attachments:

1. List of attendees
2. April 2 meeting agenda
3. Resolutions and documents discussed and voted on.

April 2, 2025

LIST OF ATTENDEES

118 Total Attendees

46 Senators Present: Supriya Baily , Ioannis Bellos, Alok Berry, Lee Black, Johanna Bockman, Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Jamie Clark, Richard Craig , Tim Curby, Delton Daigle, John Dale, Sebahattin Demirkan, Kevin Dunayer, 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, Alex Monea, ThanhVu Nguyen, Robert Osgood, Anna Pollack, Greg Robinson, Pierre Rodgers, Ellen Rowe, Catherine Sausville, Zachary Schrag, Solon Simmons, Cristiana Stan, Caroline Sutter, Anthony Terrell, Benoit Van Aken, Mohan Venigalla, David Wong, Abbas Zaidi, Jie Zhang

7 Senators Absent: Jehanzeb Cheema, Doris Davis, Ed Gero, Aditya Johri, Laurie Miller, Valerie Olmo, Debra Stroiney

1 Ex-officio Senators Present: Ann Ardis

71 Guests Present: Ghada Abdelmoumin, Paul Allvin, Elizabeth Alman, Dominique Banville, Ernest Barreto, Heidi Blackburn, Chrishon Blackwell, Tom Bluestein, Laurence Bray, Lisa Breglia, Alecia Bryan, Crystal Buckley, Tom Butler, Xiaomei Cai, Jacqueline Connor, Aurali Dade, Truman Deree, Fatou Diouf , Christopher DiTeresi, Vicki Dominick, Michelle Dromgold-Sermen, Kim Eby, Rachel Elliott, Kimberly Foecke, Kimberly Ford, Cynthia Fuchs, Charlotte Gill, Amanda Girard, Marcy Glover, Pallavi Gullo, Tamara Harvey, Caitlin Horan, Kimberly Jackson Davidson, Joseph Kochanek, Vin Lacovara, Andrew Lane, Susan Lawrence, Amy Lebrecht, Tim Leslie, Christopher Lowder, Amanda Madden, Samantha McClelland, Jenna McGwin, Jenny Meslener, Kristal Miller, Janette Muir, Eunkyong Park, Thomas Polk, Laura Poms, Cesar Rebellon, Shelley Reid, Keith Renshaw, Lauren Reuscher, Cortney Rinker, Marguerite Rippy, Kristoffer Roberts, David Rosenblum, Mohammad Salama, Mohmmad Salama, Susan Sandler, Gurdip Singh, Rebecca Sutter, Burak Tanyu, Joel Thurston, Susan Tomasovic, Cathy Tompkins, Girum Urgessa, Eleanor Weis, Liz White, Tricia Wilson, Lori Yi

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
AGENDA FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
April 2, 2025
3:00-4:15 p.m.
<https://gmu.zoom.us/j/92816138597> *

- I. Call to order
- II. Approval of the Minutes:
March 19, 2025
- III. Opening Remarks & Announcements from the Senate President
 - A. Announcements
- IV. Committee Reports
 - A. Academic Policies
 - i. AP 1.3.4 - Repeating a Course (vote)
 - ii. AP 1.4.4 - Graduate Course Enrollment by Undergraduates (vote)
 - iii. AP 1.4.6 - Enrolling for Credit Without Grade Points (Satisfactory/No Credit) (vote)
 - iv. AP.2.5 - Course Syllabi (vote)
 - B. Budget and Resources
 - C. Faculty Matters
 - i. Draft Resolution on Policy 1201
 - D. Nominations
 - i. Please apply for all positions that have circulated
 - E. Organization and Operations
 - F. Faculty Handbook
 - § 2.11.2.2 Grievance Procedures (vote)
 - § 2.8.5 Remand Process (vote)
- V. New Business
- VI. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty
- VII. Adjournment

* Note: For security purposes, all attendees must login using any valid Zoom account to join the meeting. Having trouble joining the meeting with the link above?

- 1. If using GMU Zoom Account (required for all Faculty Senators)
 - a. Go to <https://gmu.zoom.us>
 - b. Click on [Sign into Your Account]
 - c. Use GMU login credentials to login. (May require 2FA authentication)
 - d. Once logged in – click on “JOIN A MEETING”
 - e. Enter the Meeting ID (see highlighted above) and click JOIN
- 2. Joining Senate Meeting using an account other than GMU Zoom Account
 - a. Go to <https://zoom.us>
 - b. Click on [SIGN IN]

- c. Use credentials for your existing zoom account
- d. Once logged in – click on “JOIN A MEETING”
- e. Enter the Meeting ID (see highlighted above) and click JOIN
- f. If asked for Passcode: enter the Passcode (highlighted above)

Appendix A Academic Policy Changes

AP.1.3.4 Repeating a Course

Some undergraduate and graduate level courses are annotated in the catalog as "repeatable for credit." These are courses which students may repeat and receive additional credit for each time the course is taken. The maximum number of credits is specified in each course's description. Special topics and independent study courses are examples. All grades and credits earned are included in the calculation of the student's GPA up to the maximum allowable credits. In cases where the student has exceeded allowable credits in a repeatable class, the grade and credits of the earliest registration of the class for which credit was earned will not be included in the calculation of the cumulative GPA but will remain on the transcript. Effective July 1, 2011, Federal Regulations no longer allow federal student aid funds to apply to courses that a student has already taken twice with a passing grade. This limitation does not include courses that are "repeatable for credit," as described above. Students should contact the [Office of Student Financial Aid](#) to determine how repeated coursework would affect their financial aid eligibility.

Academic programs may have more restrictive limits. A W does not count as a graded attempt. This policy applies only to repeating the same course, or courses that are designated in the catalog as equivalent. Academic programs may restrict all students from repeating certain courses. All courses taken, and their grades, remain part of the student's transcript. The exclusion of earlier grades and credits from the calculation of the graduate cumulative GPA will not change the academic standing for the earlier semester. A grade in a Mason course will not be excluded from the GPA based on taking an equivalent course at another university.

At the Undergraduate Level

Undergraduate students (degree-seeking or non-degree) may repeat undergraduate courses that are not repeatable for credit. There is a limit of three graded attempts for all courses. Academic programs may have more restrictive limits. A W does not count as a graded attempt. This policy applies only to repeating the same course, or courses that are designated in the catalog as equivalent. Academic programs may restrict all students from repeating certain courses or restrict students from repeating high-demand courses for the purpose of improving a satisfactory grade. Academic programs may restrict repeats of certain courses by students in their major. Excessive repeats may result in termination from the major. (See [AP 5.2.4 Termination from the Major.](#)) Appeals to this policy begin with the student's academic advisor. The grade received in a repeated course will replace the earlier grade in the calculation of the GPA, even if the more recent grade is lower. Duplicate credit is not earned. All courses taken and their grades remain part of the student's transcript. The exclusion of earlier grades and credits from the calculation of the GPA will not change the academic standing or dean's list notations for the earlier semester. A grade in a Mason course will not be excluded from the GPA based on taking an equivalent course at another university.

At the Graduate Level

Graduate students who have earned a satisfactory grade in a course that is not repeatable for credit, as noted in the catalog, are not permitted to repeat the course without approval from the dean or director of the College/School and the Graduate Division. Grades of B- and higher are considered satisfactory unless the academic program specifies a higher minimum

satisfactory grade in their program requirements as noted in the catalog. Students must obtain permission from their academic program to repeat a course that is listed in the catalog as not repeatable for credit and in which they have earned an unsatisfactory grade. Each unit establishes criteria for granting such permission.

When a course is repeated by a graduate student, the last grade received will replace any earlier grade in the calculation of the graduate cumulative GPA, even if the most recent grade is lower. Duplicate credit is not earned. When a course is repeated, the grades of all credits attempted count towards eligibility for academic warning, probation, termination, or dismissal. Only one grade per course may apply towards a conferred graduate degree; however, the transcript will show grades for all courses attempted. Any earlier attempts of a course listed as not repeatable for credit are excluded from graduate cumulative GPA calculation.

AP.1.3.4 Repeating a Course

Some undergraduate and graduate level courses are annotated in the catalog as "repeatable for credit." These are courses which students may repeat and receive additional credit for each time the course is taken. The maximum number of credits is specified in each course's description. Special topics and independent study courses are examples. All grades and credits earned are included in the calculation of the student's GPA up to the maximum allowable credits. In cases where the student has exceeded allowable credits in a repeatable class, the grade and credits of the earliest registration of the class for which credit was earned will not be included in the calculation of the cumulative GPA but will remain on the transcript. Effective July 1, 2011, Federal Regulations no longer allow federal student aid funds to apply to courses that a student has already taken twice with a passing grade. This limitation does not include courses that are "repeatable for credit," as described above. Students should contact the Office of Student Financial Aid to determine how repeated coursework would affect their financial aid eligibility.

At the Undergraduate Level

Undergraduate students (degree-seeking or non-degree) may repeat undergraduate courses that are not repeatable for credit. There is a limit of three graded attempts for all courses. Academic programs may have more restrictive limits. A W does not count as a graded attempt. This policy applies only to repeating the same course, or courses that are designated in the catalog as equivalent. Academic programs may restrict all students from repeating certain courses or restrict students from repeating high-demand courses for the purpose of improving a satisfactory grade. Academic programs may restrict repeats of certain courses by students in their major. Excessive repeats may result in termination from the major. (See AP 5.2.4 Termination from the Major.) Appeals to this policy begin with the student's academic advisor.

The grade received in a repeated course will replace the earlier grade in the calculation of the GPA, even if the more recent grade is lower. Duplicate credit is not earned. All courses taken and their grades remain part of the student's transcript. The exclusion of earlier grades and credits from the calculation of the GPA will not change the academic standing or dean's list notations for the earlier semester. A grade in a Mason course will not be excluded from the GPA based on taking an equivalent course at another university.

At the Graduate Level

Graduate students who have earned a satisfactory grade in a course that is not repeatable for credit, as noted in the catalog, are not permitted to repeat the course for replacement credit without approval from the dean or director of the College/School and the Graduate Division. Grades of B- and higher are considered satisfactory unless the academic program specifies a higher minimum satisfactory grade in their program requirements as noted in the catalog. Students must obtain permission from their academic program to repeat a course that is listed in the catalog as not repeatable for credit and in which they have earned an unsatisfactory grade. Each unit establishes procedures criteria for granting such permission.

Formatted: Font: Bold, Underline

Formatted: Font: Bold, Underline

When a course is repeated by a graduate student, the last grade received will replace any earlier grade in the calculation of the graduate cumulative GPA, even if the most recent grade is lower. Duplicate credit is not earned. When a course is repeated, the grades of all credits attempted are used to count towards eligibility for academic warning, probation, termination, or dismissal. Only one grade per course may apply towards a conferred graduate degree. The however, the transcript will shows grades for all courses attempted. Only one grade per course may be presented on the degree application. Any earlier attempts of a course listed as not repeatable for credit are excluded from graduate cumulative GPA calculation.

Academic programs may have more restrictive limits. A W does not count as a graded attempt. This policy applies only to repeating the same course, or courses that are designated in the catalog as equivalent. Academic programs may restrict all students from repeating certain courses.

All courses taken, and their grades, remain part of the student's transcript. The exclusion of earlier grades and credits from the calculation of the graduate cumulative GPA will not change the academic standing for the earlier semester. A grade in a Mason course will not be excluded from the GPA based on taking an equivalent course at another university.

Effective July 1, 2011, Federal Regulations no longer allow federal student aid funds to apply to courses that a student has already taken twice with a passing grade. This limitation does not include courses that are "repeatable for credit," as described above. Students should contact the Office of Student Financial Aid to determine how repeated coursework would affect their financial aid eligibility.

AP.1.4.4 Graduate Course Enrollment by Undergraduates

Courses numbered 700 and above are closed to undergraduates. Undergraduates in degree programs may enroll in graduate-level courses 500 to 699 only with written permission, which must be obtained before registration. To enroll in graduate courses for credit applicable to an undergraduate degree, under this policy, undergraduates must have completed all course prerequisites. Enrollment in the graduate course is at the discretion of the course instructor and students must submit the appropriate form.

This policy is not applicable, and written permission is waived for undergraduate students admitted to George Mason combined bachelor's/accelerated master's programs. Such students are referred to AP.6.7. Undergraduates enrolled in graduate courses are eligible to receive only those letter grades applicable to graduate grading. For more information, AP.3 Grading. A minimum grade of B- in a graduate course is required to apply graduate credit towards a George Mason graduate degree or certificate. See AP.6.5.2 for further information.

To enroll in graduate courses for credit that are not applicable to an undergraduate degree and are held in reserve to apply later toward a graduate degree, undergraduates must obtain approval through the appropriate [form](#) for reserve graduate credit. Approval is given only to George Mason seniors within 15 credits of completing undergraduate study who have successfully completed all course prerequisites. In addition, this privilege is normally extended only to seniors who have completed at least 12 credits at the university, have a cumulative GPA of 3.00 or better, and have a major in the local academic unit (LAU) offering the course.

Approval for reserve graduate credit is limited to 6 credits and does not imply approval for admission into a George Mason graduate program or that credit earned will be accepted at another graduate school.

AP.1.4.4 Graduate Course Enrollment by Undergraduates

Courses numbered 700 and above are closed to undergraduates.

Undergraduates in degree programs may enroll in graduate-level courses 500 to 699 only with written permission, which must be obtained before registration. ~~Forms are available at Office of the University Registrar. This policy is not applicable, and w~~

~~written permission is waived for undergraduate students admitted to George Mason combined bachelor's/accelerated master's~~

~~programs. Such students are~~

~~referred to . Undergraduates enrolled in graduate courses are eligible to~~

~~receive only those letter grades applicable to graduate grading. For~~

~~more information, AP.3 Grading. A minimum grade of B- in a~~

~~graduate course is required to apply graduate credit towards a~~

~~George Mason graduate degree or certificate.~~

See for further information.

To enroll in graduate courses for credit applicable to an

undergraduate degree, under this policy, undergraduates must

have completed all course prerequisites, ~~have exhausted all upper-~~

~~level undergraduate courses relevant to their educational objectives,~~

~~and be able to demonstrate the level of maturity required for~~

~~graduate courses. Enrollment in the graduate course is at the~~

~~discretion of the course instructor and students must submit the~~

~~appropriate form.~~

To enroll in graduate courses for credit that are not applicable to an undergraduate degree and are held in reserve to apply later toward a graduate degree, undergraduates must obtain approval through

the appropriate form Approval to register for for reserve graduate credit. Approval (earned credit held in reserve to apply later toward a graduate degree)

is given only to George Mason seniors within 15 credits of completing undergraduate study who have successfully

completed all course prerequisites. In addition, this privilege is normally extended only to seniors who have completed at least 12

credits at the university, have a cumulative GPA of

3.00 or better, and have a major in the department local academic unit (LAU) offering the course. Approval for reserve graduate

credit is limited to 6 credits and does not imply approval for

admission into a George Mason graduate program or that credit

earned will be accepted at another graduate school.

~~Undergraduates enrolled in graduate courses are eligible to receive~~

~~only those letter grades applicable to graduate grading. For more~~

~~information, AP.3 Grading. Credit for the same course may not be~~

~~applied to both graduate and undergraduate degrees.~~

AP.2.5 Course Syllabi

All courses at George Mason University are required to have a syllabus available to students from the start of the course. Syllabi must include at least:

- Course-specific structural elements, specifically:
 - Course Number and Title
 - Course Overview - expanded description of the course. If this is a University designated Mason Core, writing intensive (WI), research and scholarship intensive (RS), or notated course, include relevant details.
 - Learning Outcomes
 - Instructor Name and Contact information
 - Meeting Times and Modality
 - Grading Policies, including
 - Grading Schema: Numerical breakdown of A, B, C, etc. (or equivalent for other grading systems)
 - Grade Weights: How assignments/exams count for the final grade
 - Policies that can significantly lower student grades, such as Late Work
 - A statement about allowable and prohibited uses of AI tools, with as much specificity as possible.

- An addendum provided by the University identifying and describing relevant university policies. This addendum is maintained by the Stearns Center, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Academic Policies Committee. Each syllabus must include either the addendum in full or a link to the online version of that addendum. A link on a university-supported learning management system used by the course satisfies this requirement.

A syllabus template will be available for instructors, though its usage is not required. Colleges and Local Academic Units may have more specific requirements regarding the syllabi of courses from within their units, in which case those also apply.

AP.2.5 Course Syllabi

All courses at George Mason University are required to have a syllabus available to students from the start of the course. Syllabi must include at least:

- Course-specific structural elements, specifically:
 - Course Number and Title
 - Course Overview - expanded description of the course. If this is a University designated Mason Core, writing intensive (WI), research and scholarship intensive (RS), or notated course, include relevant details.
 - Learning Outcomes
 - Instructor Name and Contact information
 - Meeting Times and Modality
 - Grading Policies, including
 - Grading Schema: Numerical breakdown of A, B, C, etc. (or equivalent for other grading systems)
 - Grade Weights: How assignments/exams count for the final grade
 - Policies that can significantly lower student grades, such as Late Work
 - A statement about allowable and prohibited uses of AI tools, with as much specificity as possible.

- An addendum provided by the University identifying and describing relevant university policies. This addendum is maintained by the Stearns Center, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Academic Policies Committee. Each syllabus must include either the addendum in full or a link to the online version of that addendum. A link on a university-supported learning management system used by the course satisfies this requirement.

A syllabus template will be available for instructors, though its usage is not required.

Colleges and Local Academic Units may have more specific requirements regarding the syllabi of courses from within their units, in which case those also apply.

AP.1.4.6 Enrolling for Credit Without Grade Points (Satisfactory/No Credit)

Courses normally graded as satisfactory/no credit (S/NC) are annotated in the catalog; however, students may elect to take credit without grade points. Undergraduates may take up to 6 credits to be graded S/NC; this option applies only to electives outside the field of the major, concentration, minor, general education requirement, or certificate program. Graduate students may elect the S/NC grade option only for courses that do not apply to the degree or certificate requirements. For more information, see [AP.3.3 Additional Grade Notations](#).

AP.1.4.6 Enrolling for Credit Without Grade Points (Satisfactory/No Credit)

Courses normally graded as satisfactory/no credit (S/NC) are annotated in the catalog ~~but ;~~ however, students may elect to take credit without grade points. Undergraduates may take up to 6 credits to be graded S/NC; this option applies only to electives outside the field of the major, concentration, minor, general education requirement, or certificate program. Graduate students may elect the S/NC grade option only for courses that do not apply to the degree or certificate requirements. ~~S/NC grading will also be used for courses numbered 998 and 999.~~ For more information, see [AP.3.3 Additional Grade Notations](#).

Appendix B

The Faculty Matters Committee

Proposed Draft Resolution on UP 1201.

Up for vote at the Faculty Senate Meeting, April 2, 2025

WHEREAS, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states that “no individual, on the basis of race, color, national origin, shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination in, a Federally assisted program or activity,” and

WHEREAS, on May 7, 2024, the US Department of Education expressed concern for “students and school community members who are or are perceived because of their shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics to be Jewish, Israeli, Muslim, Arab, Sikh, South Asian, Hindu, Palestinian, or any other faith or ancestry,” and

WHEREAS, the August 27, 2024 revision of University Policy 1201 does not address all such discrimination equally, and

WHEREAS, the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism and examples do not by themselves provide clear guidance on distinguishing anti-Semitism from legitimate political speech and action concerning Zionism, Israel, and Palestine,

RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate calls on President Washington to update University Policy 1201 to:

- Remove the sentence, “The ACC office will consider the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism and examples (as set forth in U.S. Executive Order 13899 and Chapter 471 of the 2023 Virginia Acts of Assembly) to the extent that they might be useful as evidence of discriminatory intent, without diminishing or infringing any right protected under the Constitution and laws of the United States and the Commonwealth of Virginia.”
- Replace that sentence with the passage: “The Office of Access, Compliance, and Community will take care to prevent discrimination against students and school community members who are or are perceived because of their shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics to be Jewish, Israeli, Muslim, Arab, Sikh, South Asian, Hindu, Palestinian, or any other faith or ancestry, without diminishing or infringing any right protected under the Constitution and laws of the United States and the Commonwealth of Virginia. In doing so, the DEI office will consider the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism and examples, the Jerusalem Declaration on Antisemitism, The Nexus Document: Understanding Antisemitism at its Nexus with Israel and Zionism, and other relevant scholarly guidelines.

- Add language to the accompanying procedure requiring the Office of Access, Compliance, and Community to consult with faculty with relevant academic expertise when academic appropriateness or academic freedom is implicated.¹

¹ This language is based on University of California, Anti-Discrimination Policy, as revised August 29, 2024.

2.11.2.2 Grievance Procedures (vote)

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.

2.8.5 Remand Process (vote)

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.