

GMU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: October 15, 2025

Time: 3:03 PM - 4:24 PM

Opening Remarks

- The meeting was called to order by Chair Solon Simmons at 3:03 PM.
- Minutes are posted on the Faculty Senate homepage.
- Discussion of GMU Board of Visitors meeting today. Concerns were expressed regarding whether BOV executive committee has power to transact BOV business during a recess vs adjournment.
- Future of Graduate Education Committee was convened.

President Gregory Washington Remarks

- Provided an overview of the university's status amid federal investigations.
- Enrollment updates: largest class enrolled, direct entry is going well, challenges with international student visas.
- New facilities opened: Fuse building in Arlington and Life Sciences and Engineering building in Manassas.
- Discussion on university policy changes and shared governance.

• Questions

o Concerns raised about the incorporation of the definition of anti-Semitism.
Proposal to form a task force to address the Senate's resolution on policy amendments.

o Discussed aspects of the new federal higher education compact as it relates to GMU, which went test optional in 2007, GMU is an access university and recommend further discussion and consideration should it be relevant for GMU.

- o Law school foundation passed by the BOV, raised questions regarding process and oversight, offered opening a broader discussion on these topics.

Admissions Committee Charge Revision

Committee Reports

- **Academic Policies:** Review of the 2028-2029 calendar and Summer 2026 calendar. CPH renaming a department to Health Administration, Policy and Informatics.
- **Budget and Resources:** Financial updates provided by Daniel Stephens, highlighted cash reserves, key investments and lower than expected benefits costs.
- **Nominations:** Lee Black presented a slate of nominees who were elected by voice vote.
 - o **Nominations Committee:** Shora Moteabbed elected.
 - o **Faculty Matters Committee:** Lisa A Giacumo elected.
 - o **Mason Core Committee:** Don Starr elected.
 - o **Academic Appeals, University Grievance, and Writing Across the Curriculum Committees:** Linda Amarola, Amanda Caswell, and Todd Laporte elected, respectively.
- **Operations and Organization:** Proposal to revise the admissions committee charge to improve efficiency and ensure faculty engagement. Motion to adopt changes in charge, membership, and meeting frequency approved by voice vote.
 - o Formal call for Senator input on bylaws and standing rules. Contact csausvil@gmu.edu and zschrage@gmu.edu with suggestions.

New Business

- Reminder about IT Security Awareness Training deadlines.

Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 4:24 PM.

Next Meeting: Scheduled for November 13, 2025 at 3pm on zoom

Transcription:

Gregory Washington: Just a few programming notes. I'm not going to do a formal presentation. Given that we just had the town hall this week. I know a number of you attended that. There's been a significant amount of interaction, a lot of things happening on campus. I want to leave as much time as I can for questions.

And, the final piece is, I had a, an emergency tooth extraction. Well, not an emergency, but I had a tooth extraction. Today, I'm not riding on all four wheels, so to speak. And so, if you see me put something on the of my face, you know. You know, you get the benefit of me speaking a little less today. Given the position I'm in, and I'm sure, for some of you, probably happy about that.

Let me highlight a couple of things, and then just open it up for questions. Look, the bottom line up front is that the campus is doing reasonably okay. I mean, for a campus that's under 5 major investigations. You wouldn't know it if you walked onto campus. You wouldn't, our students are going to classes, our faculty are conducting research, our offices are still operating and functioning as they should. And so, rest assured, the campus is moving along. As it would under normal operations. We enrolled our largest class ever this past year. And, our direct entry program is going extraordinarily well. We went through a ranking season and all of the turmoil in the past hasn't hurt us dramatically. To the negative, relative to that, we are still very, very well positioned, on the rankings front. We just got the Carnegie classification in this past year, and of all institutions in our Commonwealth, we had the highest overall classification, in terms of high access and high outcomes. And so, are there challenges? Yes, right?

We're going to see some short-term funding challenges relative to international students. We're dealing with the aftermath of what happens when the students can't get visas, they can't get in to the country, and so we're seeing some challenges there.

We're seeing some challenges, relative to our research. Albeit the number of terminations of awards has declined dramatically. We have leveled off there, and so we're not losing as many. I think our grand total now stands at about 57 terminated awards. 9 of those we've been able to get resumed, however.

And so... Look I feel like, we're just... we're doing what we do at Mason. We are navigating through, right? We are... we're managing, we're navigating, we do what we do, And... I feel pretty good with those overall outcomes. We opened Fuse a couple of weeks ago, I do know there were a number of faculty there, I don't know if anybody on this call was there, but it was spectacular. It is the most beautiful academic building on the inside. It is the most beautiful academic building I've ever seen, and it is fantastic. And the faculty who are out there, the laboratories, it is just a fantastic environment. And so, if you haven't been out there it is worth your time to go and see what's happening in Arlington at that campus. We opened up our Life Sciences and Engineering building on the campus in Manassas, on our SciTech campus. That is an extraordinarily beautiful building as well. Not as beautiful as the one in Arlington. But beautiful in his own right. Our students are heavily using it. When, you know, it's interesting what a new facility can actually do to a campus. So, we got a lot of student engagement and student usage there, and then we'll open up another facility here within the next month or two on main campus, our activities and community wellness building. We're continuing to do what we do. That's kind of how you would want it. Right? We're going to manage what we need to manage with the investigations and the like. And we'll get through it, one way or the other. But... We are managing this campus. This campus continues to move forward. And I, want to commend and thank you all for the support that you have given, the support you've given me, the support that you have given this campus. You stood up for the campus. And that's a big deal. Don't let anybody tell you otherwise. That's a significant feat, and you all should feel proud of that. And I'll end on this.

We continue to move through a series of high highs and low lows, right? A series of great outcomes and You know, meaningful crises. The one thing that we've been able to maintain is our partnership together. And that partnership is what has helped us be successful up to this point. I believe... We are writing the book right now. Together on how university leadership and faculty, administration and, faculty governance. We're rewriting the book on what that should look like. Right? And you all should take some heed in that. And so, on that note, I will pause and open it up for questions.

Solon Simmons: Thanks, Greg. Thanks so much for that, and for your kind words, and for your leadership through all this. It's been quite something, and I've never looked at a teabag quite the same way again, now that we realize what that metaphor, how that works. So anyway, we really, really appreciate it, but we know how this works, so we'll just run through any of you who want to ask questions. Please do. We'll start with Senator Schrag.

Zachary Schrag: Thanks. I do have a question about university administration and faculty governance. In August 2024, without consulting the Faculty Senate, you approved a change to University Policy 1201, incorporating the IHR definition of anti-Semitism. In April of 2025, this body called on you to amend that policy to recognize the documented discrimination against a range of ancestries, not just people of Jewish and Israeli descent. And to include multiple definitions of anti-Semitism to secure the freedom of our community to speak freely. As you may know, in September of this year, a federal district court ruling in the case of AUP versus Rubio noted that the IRHR definition labels as antisemitism a great deal of protected constitutional speech. As of this afternoon, however, University Policy 1201 remains unchanged, chilling the ability of Mason students, faculty, and others to express their constitutionally protected views. So, can you tell us why you have ignored our Senate resolution on this issue?

Gregory Washington: Well, when we had the discussion, and I think I've had the discussion with a number of you on this particular item. The university was in its rights to modify that policy as we modified it. And, and so... If you... you want to sit down and go through the regulations of how that was modified. I'm more than happy to do that part with

you. The second piece here that I think, and then that's relative to 1201, right? But we had this discussion before. I get that we don't agree. But... but we continue, we can continue to have the discussion. Relative to you know, there's a lot that has transpired relative to the anti-Semitism resolution, how that resolution connects to 1201 and the like. And so, there are board-related components of this as well. That have to be brought into play. Given that board resolution and what emanated after that, before the modification, or, excuse me, after the modification of 1201. And so, if you really, you know, in the nature of shared governance, why don't we do this? Let's pull together a small group. I will put some folk from my administration on it. You, the faculty, can pull together a group, and let's go through it. And you know, our folk will point to what where we think we were doing what was what we were allowed to do. You all can point to where you feel that that's wrong, and I think what would be good is that we have a report that we can actually share with the Senate, that juxtaposes both sides of this in very clear fashion, so people can see what each side was thinking about relative to this. So, if you were amenable to that. I'm amenable to, to that as well.

Solon Simmons: Great. You need to follow up on that, Zach?

Solon Simmons: Okay, great. Mohan, go ahead.

Mohan Venigalla: Oh, Greg, thank you for giving that opportunity for us to meet with you on this, Policy 1201. When we brought that resolution, what we, I mean, it's basically we are not, we are not contradicting anything Board has done. We are actually working with the board. We are expanding what the board has been defining as antisemitism. It's like we are expanding it to other groups as well, so I just wanted to. So, no, look, I think I understand that, and I'm not from an operational perspective.

Gregory Washington: You know, absolutely, we should consider that.

Mohan Venigalla: And if it makes the document stronger.

Gregory Washington: Then we should look at doing that, okay? And so, I'm not against that. Okay. I just want to make sure we're all on the same page as to why the original

decision was made to modify 1201 as it was done. Because that's what was the first part of Zach's statement, and so I want to make sure we deal with that. And if we want to if you want to make amendments to it and change it, we can go that route, too. Let's sit down and have a reasonable discussion about it. We're not going to figure it out right here.

Gregory Washington: Okay? But I am willing to have some folks sit down with you to work... to work through it, and to come up with something that's more amenable if... if we... if we actually need to do that.

Solon Simmons: And if I could just say, I think you'll find that it was a pretty careful document that we tried to make it as amenable to a win-win as possible, as far as I can remember how it worked forward, so I think we'll have good progress on that. Go ahead, Bethany.

Bethany Letiecq: Thank you. I appreciate Zach bringing this up, and, you know, I think that, from the AUP's perspective, we've also been really clear about what we think about the IRHIRE, this definition, and really welcome the opportunity to revisit that. Maybe not to revisit the history so much as, for the potential for change. I think the Senate resolution was really strong. So, but that's not what I wanted to ask you. I feel bad that you got a tooth pulled today, and it made me think, this next question, I don't know if it'll be worse than getting a tooth pulled, or... or what, but, so sorry. I'll try to frame it kindly. I really... I really wanted to talk about the compact.

The, you know, nine schools were invited, to sign this compact, or what we're calling a loyalty oath. And, you know, and obviously now the national discourse is, you know, who's going to sign on and who's going to reject this compact, and you know, I'm obviously, really concerned about the compact for its chilling effect on free speech and academic freedom, but I'm also really concerned about what signing on to this compact would mean for gender studies, across many disciplines, from biology to gender women's studies and beyond, and our ability to really engage in discourses of gender, because the compact, I think, would be very deleterious to that. So, I'm wondering if you, can speak to your thoughts on the

compact. I mean, I'm hoping that you'll reject it outright, but I would love to hear what your what your thoughts are today about it.

Gregory Washington: Okay, well... You're, you're right, you know, I'd rather have the toothache. But let's talk through this. You know, and as much as I as much as I possibly can.

So... the way I see the compact, and the way I see the outcomes of it. There are some, at least on the surface. Some real challenges. With respect to how it aligns with Mason values. Okay, and so I think, from a very high-level perspective. I have told you that that's what I do. When we look at any issue. I go back to our core values, and I ask, how is this policy change, or how is this entity going to be in alignment, or not in alignment with core values. Based on how I'm interpreting it, there are some challenges there. I won't get into all of the details. But suffice to say, again, this is one of those things where if we get to the point, we should have some real discussions on what it actually means for a place like Mason. Okay? I'll be if I were to be as specific as I can. Well, first of all, let me back up. Let me make sure that... everybody understands the policy areas of the compact, from how I'm giving you how I've interpreted the, I think it's an 11, 12-page document, how I've interpreted a document, and so there are policies related to admissions and hiring criteria. What the compact says is that we have to ban consideration of race, sex, ethnicity. Nationality, political views, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious associations or proxies to those and those entities, right? And so... look, the reality is this, what this does is it essentially removes some of the affirmative action policies that we put in place and had been law up to this point. And it expands beyond, it expands legally barred categories to a broad range of identity factors, right? And so, we have to ask ourselves how those fit relative to who we are at Mason, and is that in alignment with us? It, requires standardized testing. To all undergraduate applicants. Remember, George Mason went test optional in 2007? And we have been test-optional. You know, I've had a number of people prescribe the test optional framework. To me, but it's interesting, test optional frameworks were in existence at George Mason long before I got here, and to be honest with you, we should always ask ourselves, why did the campus go test-optional? And why did it go test

optional? Back at a time when it wasn't political. It wasn't a political issue, for George Mason when it went test-optional. It went, test-optional because we were seeing that aid, the metrics that were used for lack of a better way of putting this, were not predictive of Mason student success. They were other methods, other metrics we were using that had a higher predictive capability. So, the test wasn't doing for us what it might be doing for other entities, right? Most institutions, most for lack of a better way of putting it, most selective institutions use standardized testing as a way of weeding out students. Well, when you're an ACCESS program, when you admit 90% of the people who apply, you don't really need a framework to weed out students. Right? So, for them, it's just another for us, it would be just another hurdle, and we have to ask ourselves, do we want to put that hurdle in place for our students? The international student enrollment piece would not affect Mason, even though we have the largest international enrollment in the country, I mean, in the Commonwealth, that international enrollment is primarily on the undergrad I mean, graduate students, and this the international enrollment cap it's focused on undergraduate students, not graduate students, and most of our international students are our graduate. The free speech and ideological diversity piece is something that we'd have to you know, we'd have to talk about, right? Because there's stuff in there that talks about, abolish institutional units, that purposefully punish, belittle. Or even spoke violence against conservative ideas. Right? Well, what does that mean? Does that mean people can't speak out against those ideas who believe differently on our campus? Groups speak out on both sides of these issues. You know, one of the great things about here is you have conservatives criticizing progressives, you have progressives criticizing conservatives, right? The compact is written such that it only looks like it penalizes one direction, and so we... these are things that would have to be ferreted out, and so I can't tell you exactly where we would come down on this, but I can tell you from the looks of it on the surface, there are things there that seem to be out of alignment with Mason core values and how we operate, and I would, if it got to the point where we had to consider it. I would look for a broader discussion amongst members of the community, you all and the board to sit down and come forward with discussions on these issues. I just think that you know, I know you

want a yes or no answer, Bethany, but this is a lot more complicated than yes or no. This is... there are nuances here that, in my opinion, should really be discussed. And we should really understand how something like this would affect our campus, and what would affect who we are. So, I'll just leave it at that. I hope that answers your question.

Bethany Letiecq: Yeah, I appreciate the discourse, and I think it's something that, you know, the Senate should also be looking at very carefully, right? And I also just wanted to say I appreciated your town hall, and I agree with you that, you know, I think Solon said this, that, you know, the recent battles that we've been fighting, I agree, they've been very difficult, and I'm certainly sensitive to, you know, you and your family and your well-being, but I also think, you know, these most recent struggles have... I think they really have brought us together in some really powerful ways, and I'm just glad we're all still standing at this point, so thank you.

Gregory Washington: Thanks, appreciate it.

Solon Simmons: One last thing on the compact that's interesting to me is that it seems to stress that new Carnegie classification in a certain kind of hidden way.

Gregory Washington: Yeah, isn't that something? And that's a way in which Mason would benefit. I wonder if we could, like, somehow feed back to Department of Ed so that they rethink a little. Well, so, my understanding, too, and the reason why I think it's a little premature to say yay or nay on this right now is I think this compact is going to change. There is a national discourse going on relative to the Compact. They actually did offer discussion. We'll see what it looks like. And then, you know, there is an additional piece here for us to consider at Mason, when we do get to the point of whatever the final document looks like. You do know that UVA is one of the named schools. And I saw a letter that came from, I think it was members of the Senate. I don't know if the House members had signed on to it, but members of the Virginia Senate definitely had. I saw Louise Lucas's name on it, and Mamie Locke and Scott Surovell, and some others basically saying that they were going to withhold funds from UVA if UVA signed that compact, and I interpret that, that they would withhold funds from us as well. And so I think any institution who's

considering that would also have to look at what it means for state support. Now remember, our state support has increased. To the tune of permanent support, and that the government doesn't give permanent money. The federal government doesn't give permanent money, but the state does. And for George Mason. That amount is close to \$200 million of additional state support over the last 5 years. Right? And if you, you know, since it's permanent dollars, it's you know, but if you add each year's contribution up you're talking close to on the high side of a half a billion dollars. You're not talking in the same ballpark of comparison. When you talk about state dollars, and remember, that's just the growth. That's not the total amount. That's the growth that we've experienced over the last 5 years. The federal money can't match that. Right? The \$200 million that we get in research grants, it's a year-to-year dollar amount. That is lower than what we actually get in state support, right? So, all of these entities have to be balanced. You got... you don't have to just take into account what you could gain. You also must take into account what you can lose.

Solon Simmons: Thank you. Yeah, heavy stuff. Other questions for Greg while we got him? Seriously. Well... okay, so.

Gregory Washington: Zach is up again.

Zachary Schrag: Just to quickly follow up, I was thinking about this, and I realize it's been 6 months since we passed that resolution on 1201. I wonder if you can give us a timeline on when we might expect a task force to be put into place.

Gregory Washington: So, I will have folk from my team start working on it. And we'll get, we will have that task force in place by this fall. Before the end of the fall semester, okay? Which, you know, this thing is moving right along. We're at October 15th. We don't have much time left, and so give me a couple of weeks. You do know there are a few other things going on right now, too. That we're dealing with, but we will get it established and get going with it. What I'm going to need to do is find a time. Because I'm not going to be in every meeting with you all, but I will kick it off. And I want to have a time with all of you for us to really talk about the high-level issues, so you understand my personal thinking when we put

it in place and the like, and so that will be part of the challenge, is just getting that date. And getting it set aside to have that, to have that discussion.

Solon Simmons: Bethany.

Bethany Letiecq: I don't know how much time we have, but...

Gregory Washington: If I make a change, or a major change like that. I hope you all recognize, look, I'm going to try to do what's right. We may not agree, with what you know, you may think that, okay, I don't like the decision you made. I but it comes from the it comes from a perspective of me trying to make a decision that I think is the best decision for the campus. Right? And, and so I also understand that I might miss it. I might think that something is best for the campus, you might come back and say, no, it's actually not best, and here's why. I'm open to making some changes based on that, right? But understand that, you've kind of seen how I operate under pressure. I am going to do what I think is right, first and foremost. And we'll... we let the other chips fall as the other chips fall, okay? That's one thing you can count on, from me. And that's what... and so I have no... I have no qualms. I am comfortable sitting down, talking with you, and helping you understand why I made the decision I made. Because it comes from that spirit of, look, I'm just trying to do the right thing here, based on the knowledge and what was happening at the... at the specific point in time. Okay?

Solon Simmons: Okay, and we'll close... Bethany, go ahead.

Bethany Letiecq: Yeah, since no one else is asking questions, I... I have, I have another one, you know.

Gregory Washington: I don't know if I'm ready for the next one. The next one... last one made my tooth hurt.

Bethany Letiecq: Sorry about that. Yeah, just put that ice pack back on, there you go. Today, the board passed, this affiliation agreement to, you know, for the Law School Foundation. And, as mentioned by the board, you know, the AUP chapter here on campus, we raised any number of concerns. Particularly around the control of, you know, the

university's relationship, the university's relationship to that new foundation, and should that... should that new foundation engage in untoward you know, behaviors, you know, taking money from, untoward actors, dark money, you know, engage in some of those, you know, undue donor behaviors that they engaged in. You know, years ago on this campus. You know, our concern is, you know, what redress will the university have, given this affiliation agreement, that it does not appear that the university would be able to, really to take action. I understand it's just the dean of the law school would be the only university representative on the board of trustees, and of course, the board of trustees. I mean, this affiliation says the board can compensate the dean, with extra funds, and... which also feels like a bit of a conflict of interest, but I guess, you know. Do you share any of these concerns? And, you know, I know this is not an easy question either, but I appreciate your thoughts on this.

Gregory Washington: So let me go to your first point. Let me address that one, and then let's talk about the broader, on your first point. I actually think it was Solon who brought up the gift acceptance framework that's actually in that agreement, so I'm less worried about a gift coming in from an entity that the campus wouldn't want to accept the money. Because that clause that's in the establishment of that document assures that the gifts actually have to go through the Gift Acceptance Committee. So that's the way I interpret it. So, I'm less worried about that. You know, the board went through and approved that document. They did leave what I project as an opening to be able to change or modify things. And so, what I believe should happen, you know, you highlighted some concerns? To the members of the board, director, gave a lengthy response. Right? That's response is now part of the public record. And so, I think if faculty don't or take issues with the response the academic and proper thing to do at that point is to list go and respond to that, and provide feedback, and back and forth, and the interesting thing is I kind of know how you're wired, Bethany. You've come after me on these things in the past.

I got a feeling you will do that. So, I probably don't even need to make that statement. But, the reality is that this is part of a process. And given that it is part of our process, you actually have agency. Where you can bring forward your feedback and say, okay, here's how

we feel about that response, or here's where that response was sort of missing the mark, and that will open up to a broader discussion. So, I think you should handle it I think if we, if we manage it in that way, we'll have we'll have better outcomes for all.

Solon Simmons: Thank you. Okay. Thanks, Greg. We've kept you long with your toothache here, and thanks for asking all of our questions, and very pointed questions, and tough questions, and so I think that I gave a talk on a panel on a Constitution Day event, and they asked us what our favorite First Amendment was, and our least favorite, and one of the panelists said, my favorite amendment is the 14th. Because that's where they introduced the concept of due process. And what I'm hearing today is governance is process, and we're engaging in that in a very thorough way. So, you know, really great to work with you and with your focus on process and allowing us to participate. So anyway, thank you for coming. We're going to continue our business, and you don't have to stay if you don't want to, but.

Gregory Washington: Hey, I appreciate all of you. Look forward to working together in the future.

Solon Simmons: All right, thank you, thank you.

Attendee List

(44) Senators present:

First Name	Last Name
Kerri	LaCharite
Cristiana	Stan
Don	Starr
Alexandra	Masterson
Samuel	Huneke
Douglas	Eyman
Victoria	Grady
Mohan	Venigalla
Johanna	Bockman
Bethany	Letiecq
Solon	Simmons
Catherine	Sausville
Burak	Tanyu
Zachary	Schrag
Caroline	Sutter
Lisa	Billingham
Kelly	Dunne
Alireza	Ermagun
Lee	Black
Niklas	Hultin
Niki	Vlastara
Delton	Daigle
Kevin	Dunayer
Jamie	Clark
Thalia	Goldstein

Richard	Craig
John	Dale
Pierre	Rodgers
Benoit	Van Aken
Alok	Berry
Seth	Hudson
Jessica	Hurley
Christine	Barthold
Robert	Osgood
Eugene	Kontorovich
Shora	Moteabbed
Aditya	Johri
ThanhVu	Nguyen
Lisa	Giacumo
Jennifer	Salerno
Siona	Listokin
Tamara	Maddox
Derek	Horstmeyer
Anna	Pollack

(65) Ex officio/ Community member/ guest/ faculty (not senate member)

First Name	Last Name
Shannon	Davis
Yusaf	Ibrahimi
Doug	McKenna
Chris	Magee

Wayne	Adams
Xiaomei	Cai
Heidi	Blackburn
Thomas	Polk
Ernest	Barreto
Supriya	Baily
Cathy	Tompkins
Susan	Graziano
Helen	Chin
James	Broderick
LaShonda	Anthony
Kelly	Schrum
Liz	White
Stephanie	Lowe
Melissa	Broeckelman-Post
Jason	Kinser
Jen	Fehsenfeld
Ann	Ardis
Andrew	Lane
Jacqueline	Connor
Janette	Muir
Thomas	Bischoff
Kim	Eby
Katherine	Imholt
Tamara	Harvey
Rick	Heffner
Niyati	Dhokai
Tricia	Wilson
Kim	Edwards
Devon	Johnson
Jacelyn	Tyson
Amy	Lebrecht
stephanie	dodman
Amanda	Bryan
Sarah	Ward
Phillip	Zane
Julia	Shadur
Megan	DuBois
Shelby	Broberg
Anu	Aneja
Paul	Snodgrass
Michelle	Steiner
Susan	Allen

Phoebe	Gor
Cody	Edwards
Ellen	Rowe
Pam	Promisel
Melanie	O'Brien
Cameron	Harris
Caitlin	Horan
Michele	Schwietz
Lauren	Reuscher
Elizabeth	Alman
Mohammad	Salama
Alecia	Bryan
Crystal	Buckley
Anne	Osterman
Kimbely	Ford
Shelley	Reid
Kim	Dight
Katherine	Miscavige

Admissions Committee Charge

	Existing ¹	Proposed (as of April 29, 2025)
Charge	<p>Be in dialog with the admissions office about current admissions statistics and practices and provide reports to Faculty Senate.</p> <p>Explore aspects of admissions standards that may impact student recruitment, enrollment, success, and retention.</p> <p>Communicate to faculty via the Faculty Senate about activities they can engage in to help the Admissions Office.</p> <p>Be a resource to the Admissions Office for answering questions from multiple perspectives.</p> <p>Bring recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding issues impacting the admissions process</p>	<p>Be in dialog with the Admissions Office about current admissions practices and outcomes, and provide reports to the Faculty Senate.</p> <p>Explore aspects of admissions standards that may affect student recruitment, enrollment, success, and retention.</p> <p>Be a resource to the Admissions Office for providing input from faculty perspectives.</p> <p>Bring recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding issues impacting the admissions process.</p> <p>Communicate to all university faculty via the Faculty Senate about activities they can engage in to help the Admissions Office.</p>
Membership	<p>The committee membership comprises seven members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admissions Office-appointed member. • Senate-appointed member from Senate Budget and Resources committee. • 5-elected members with three-year terms. 	<p>The committee membership comprises seven members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean of Admissions or their designate (co-chair) • Senate-appointed member from Senate Budget and Resources committee (co-chair) • 5-elected members with staggered three-year terms.
Meetings	<p>The Committee will meet monthly.</p>	<p>The Committee will meet once per semester, in the first half of the semester, with more meetings scheduled as needed.</p>

¹ Charge as revised and approved by the Faculty Senate February 3, 2021, <https://facultysenate.gmu.edu/committees/university-committee-charges>