

# Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

**Date:** March 25, 2026

**Time:** 3:00 PM

**Location:** Zoom

[Meeting Board Book](#)

## 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 PM by President Solon Simmons after confirmation of quorum.

President Simmons opened with reflections on the significance of the Faculty Senate's work, emphasizing the long-term value of meeting records for future faculty and governance.

---

## 2. Approval of Minutes

The January, February, and March minutes were presented. With no corrections or additions, the minutes were approved as submitted.

---

## 3. Opening Remarks & Announcements from the President of the Senate

The President outlined that the agenda included extensive Faculty Handbook revisions. Due to volume, a spillover meeting was scheduled for April 8. All nine motions would be voted on individually using secret ballot. President Simmons emphasized that the handbook revisions represent 5+ years of shared governance work. It emerged from faculty-driven processes rather than administrative directives.

Recognition was given to Kim Eby for long-term governance contributions and Lisa Billingham for leading handbook revisions. Recognition was also given to Bethany Letiecq and Tim Gibson for their work with AAUP, acknowledging their significant organizing efforts and contributions. The President emphasized the collaborative nature of shared governance. It was noted that a board book was prepared for this meeting, though it is still a work in progress.

---

## **5.A Faculty Handbook (See [Meeting Board Book](#))**

Lisa Billingham introduced the 9 handbook motions, noting what problems were addressed for each motion, feedback received, and changes since first read. Faculty were encouraged to have reviewed materials in advance.

### **MOTION 1**

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate approve the addition of the clarifying language about each level of review in the first paragraph of 2.7 Procedures for Reappointment, Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure.

Purpose: To approve added clarifying language describing roles at each level of review and administrative recommendations in the RRPT process.

### **Key Discussions**

Feedback from the first read indicated significant concern about removing language stating that administrators should rarely overturn faculty personnel recommendations, with some viewing the change as increasing administrative power rather than simply clarifying the process. In response, it was noted that the revised version retains the original language while also adding clarifying language about the review process.

During discussion, concern was raised that the proposed changes were unnecessary, with the view expressed that the current process was not unclear. It was argued that the revisions could make it easier for deans to overturn the collective judgment of unit and college committees. Additional concern was expressed that the language remains problematic and may conflict with principles related to faculty governance, with a suggestion that the new language be removed.

### **Decision**

- Motion 1 FAILED (with 13 yes and 26 no)

### **MOTION 2**

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate approve all changes in 2.7.1, 2.7.2, 2.7.3.1, and 2.7.3.2.

Purpose: To clarify and standardize RRPT procedures by replacing references to department chairs with the broader term LAU administrators, clarifying steps for the third-year renewal process for tenure-line faculty, defining “insufficient” as fewer than three faculty, establishing consistent recusal expectations for voting, removing the option to abstain in RRPT votes, updating language to reflect current Interfolio practices for external reviews, specifying voting eligibility by rank for promotion and tenure decisions, and making minor language and punctuation corrections.

Feedback from the first read also showed strong support for removing abstentions and a need to clarify how absences, such as FMLA or study leave, are handled, with updates indicating that absences will be managed according to college or school guidelines.

### **Key Discussions**

Concerns were raised during the discussion. First, regarding voting eligibility, there was concern about limiting voting on promotions to specific ranks and the potential exclusion of full term professors and associate professors in full term and associate term professor decisions. Concern was expressed about limiting voting on full professor promotions to full professors only, particularly in smaller departments where there may be few full professors, and about potential impacts on representation.

Additional concern was raised that such limitations could affect representation at the college level, including potential gender-related impacts and reduced participation from smaller departments.

It was clarified that changes to voting eligibility apply only to tenure-track promotions and that the committee did not change voting procedures for term faculty, and units do borrow faculty from other departments and form committees.

### **Decision**

- Motion 2 FAILED (with 19 yes and 22 no)

### **MOTION 3**

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate approve the changes to 2.2 Faculty Ranks.

Purpose: To add all term faculty ranks and expand the language for tenure-line faculty by providing brief profiles for each, with feedback indicating strong support for these changes. The motion also clarifies expectations around professional, ethical, and collegial conduct, noting that these are included in Section 2.2 as expectations rather than in 2.4.

### **Key Discussions**

Concern was raised about the removal of “genuine excellence” and “high competence” as guiding concepts and how faculty would determine expectations and standards at each rank without those distinctions.

It was clarified that colleges, schools, and local units would continue to define criteria for promotion, and that expectations would still be established at the local level, with this section focused on defining roles rather than evaluation standards. Additional discussion emphasized

that the revisions aim to make faculty roles more inclusive, particularly by incorporating term faculty titles that were previously not fully represented.

Concerns were also conveyed from faculty that clearer university-level definitions of concepts such as “genuine excellence” and “high competence” would be helpful, even if specific criteria vary across units. It was noted that faculty perspectives on the shift toward a more holistic approach were mixed, with some expressing concern and others expressing support. A suggestion was made to consider forming a university-level committee to review promotion and tenure standards across colleges and improve support systems and consistency. It was clarified that this motion pertains only to definitions of faculty roles in Section 2.2, while evaluation standards would be addressed separately in Section 2.4.

### **Decision**

- Motion 3 PASSED (34 yes and 8 no)

### **MOTION 4**

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate approve the expanded definitions in 2.4 Criteria for Evaluation of Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Term Faculty.

Purpose: To update and expand the definitions in Section 2.4 by revising the titles of the evaluation categories and providing expanded and more contemporary definitions of the work included within each category. The motion also addresses feedback from the first read by clarifying that teaching focuses on learning rather than broader student outcomes, updating language to include research, scholarship, and creative activity, and refining service expectations by removing ambiguous language such as “necessary but not sufficient” and adding active participation in community-related service.

### **Key Discussions**

Discussion focused first on clarifying what Motion 4 covered. A question was raised about whether the motion addressed promotion criteria for term faculty and the progression from competence to excellence. It was clarified that this motion concerns only the expanded definitions of teaching and learning, research, scholarship and creative activity, and service and leadership, while questions about promotion standards and progression would be addressed in the next motion.

Further discussion reflected some confusion about the difference between Motion 4 and the following motion, and the actual handbook language was reviewed together. It was explained that the revisions included changing “student success” to “teaching and learning,” and expanding the language to provide more examples and greater detail about what may count as faculty work, including creative activity and interdisciplinary work.

Discussion also addressed the relationship between university-level definitions and local unit authority. It was emphasized that these are broader university-level criteria, while the actual meaning and application within a discipline would continue to be set at the department, college, school, or local academic unit level. Support was expressed for the expanded definitions as helpful for interdisciplinary faculty, term faculty, and others whose work may not fit neatly within older categories. Discussion raised concern that expanded definitions in the handbook may not be followed if they do not align with local unit practices, with the possibility that colleges could continue to deviate from handbook guidance.

Additionally, concern was expressed that leaving everything to local units could result in important types of work being overlooked or excluded, particularly if there is no requirement to consider them.

At the same time, concerns were raised that the language may be too specific or prescriptive at the handbook level, that some matters might be better handled in local unit, and that broader definitions could create confusion or unintended consequences. It was also noted that the handbook language was intended to establish the types of work valued by the institution, while local units would still determine the amount, specificity, and nuance of the criteria. It was also noted that the handbook is an evolving document and may be revised in the future.

### **Decision**

- Motion 4 PASSED (29 yes and 14 no)

### **MOTION 5**

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate approve the holistic portfolio evaluation approach in 2.4 Criteria for Evaluation of Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Term Faculty.

Purpose: Approve the revised approach to evaluation in which faculty contributions would be considered through an overall portfolio rather than through the older siloed framework of high competence and genuine excellence.

### **Key Discussions**

Faculty concerns centered on the possible loss of a clear promotion and tenure pathway for those whose strongest case rests on teaching. It was explained that in the College of Education many faculty members, especially pedagogists, have advanced through the genuine excellence in teaching pathway, and it was warned that replacing that structure with a more holistic portfolio approach could narrow opportunities at a time when external research funding is becoming more uncertain. The motion was also opposed on the grounds that it represented a “mend-it-don’t-end-it” issue, with the argument made that the teaching pathway should be strengthened and enforced across colleges rather than removed, particularly because some units had discouraged its use.

It was explained that the revision aims to elevate teaching by recognizing it more fully across the evaluation framework, including placing scholarship of teaching and learning within research and providing more pathways for faculty contributions. It was also noted that the “genuine excellence in teaching” pathway has been confusing and difficult to navigate, and that the revised structure may offer a clearer and more accessible approach.

Additional discussion highlighted that the revised approach would require greater consideration of both teaching and research and could allow more faculty to be successfully evaluated through a broader, holistic portfolio.

### **Decision**

- Motion 5 PASSED (23 yes and 14 no)

### **MOTION 6**

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate approve that the revisions to section 2.4 in the Faculty Handbook will go into effect on July 1, 2028.

Purpose: Set the effective date for the Section 2.4 revisions as July 1, 2028, giving colleges, schools, and local academic units time to revise their RRPT guidelines before the new framework takes effect.

### **Key Discussion**

It was explained that the delayed implementation date was meant to give units a practical transition period and allow time for local criteria to be updated.

A question was raised regarding how the revised rules would affect faculty already in the pipeline. It was clarified that faculty currently under review would continue under the current guidelines, while future reviews would follow updated local unit rules once those had been revised. A question was also raised about whether local units could extend the grandfathered period, particularly for faculty moving from associate to full. It was explained that the old handbook would not continue indefinitely after the transition date, though the underlying categories of work would remain recognized in expanded form. It was further noted that if units later needed more time, the Senate could revisit this through a later resolution.

Overall, the discussion reflected support for a transition period and recognition that meaningful local work would be required before the revisions could be implemented effectively.

### **Decision**

- Motion 6 PASSED (31 yes and 4 no)

---

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM, with the announcement that consideration of additional motions would reconvene at the April 8 spillover meeting to complete remaining business.

---

## **Major Discussion Themes**

Throughout the meeting, several recurring themes emerged:

Shared governance was emphasized, with a strong focus on faculty-driven decision-making and concern about preserving faculty authority in evaluation processes. A tension between standardization and flexibility was also highlighted, particularly between the need for university-wide consistency and the importance of maintaining local unit autonomy. Concerns regarding equity and representation were raised, including issues affecting smaller departments, gender representation, and the inclusion of term faculty.

Additionally, the need for greater transparency and clarity was emphasized, including the importance of clear language in policies, better communication of expectations, and accessible documentation such as board books.

## **Next Steps**

- Continuing remaining handbook motions (7,8,9,10) in April 8 spillover meeting

[Attendee List](#)

# Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

**Date:** April 8, 2026 (Spillover)

**Time:** 3:01 PM

**Location:** Zoom

[Meeting Board Book](#)

## 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 PM by Faculty Senate President Solon Simmons, after quorum was confirmed.

---

## 3. Opening Remarks & Announcements from the President of the Senate

President Solon Simmons noted that the session was a continuation of business from the March Faculty Senate meeting. Senators were encouraged to complete the Faculty and Staff Engagement Survey (Gallup poll). It was clarified that chairs are eligible to complete the survey and that it is intended for workforce planning and long-standing feedback to senior administration. It was also noted that some survey questions may feel uncomfortable, and participants were reminded that they may skip any items if they prefer.

---

## 5.A Faculty Handbook ([See Appendix A](#))

### Motion 7

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate approve the changes to 1.3.1 The General Faculty and 2.1.4 Part-Time Appointments

### Discussion:

The proposed changes focused on clarifying eligibility to serve in the Faculty Senate and ensuring consistency in how part-time faculty are defined. It was explained that the removal of the word “term” from part-time faculty was necessary because some part-time faculty are tenure-line, and the existing terminology created confusion. The motion also extends voting rights to part-time faculty as members of the general faculty.

Additionally, feedback from the first read had raised concerns that removing the phrase “any George Mason University campus” might unintentionally exclude faculty from Mason Korea. In response, the language was restored to allow for further discussion and clarification at a later

time. Overall, the changes were presented as minor but important clarifications, and no concerns or opposition were raised during discussion.

**Decision:**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

**Motion 8**

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate approve the changes to 1.3.2 The Faculty Senate.

**Discussion:**

It was explained that the change addresses a conflict between the Faculty Handbook, bylaws, and Robert's Rules regarding who may speak in Faculty Senate meetings. The proposed language allows, to the extent permitted by Senate bylaws, the Senate President to call on individuals to speak.

Discussion clarified that current handbook language could allow all members to speak, which could create challenges given the number of attendees. The change aligns the handbook with existing practice, where the presiding officer manages who speaks, and avoids situations where meetings could become difficult to manage.

It was also noted that the change provides flexibility to allow individuals beyond elected members, including committee representatives, students, or staff, to speak when appropriate. The revision was described as a cleanup effort to align governing documents with current practice rather than introducing a new process. No opposition was raised.

**Decision**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

**Motion 9**

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate approve the changes to 2.10.5 Faculty Responsibility Under the Honor Code.

**Discussion:**

It was explained that this change reflects current practice, as the Honor Code has been replaced and Academic Standards are now in effect. It was noted that the update aligns the handbook with existing policies and continues to outline faculty responsibilities under the Academic Standards Code. The change was described as a straightforward alignment and largely a minor or technical edit. No discussion or opposition was raised.

**Decision:**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

**Motion 10**

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate approve the replacement of "Master Instructor" with "Principal Instructor" in 2.1.3, 2.2, and 2.7.

**Discussion:**

It was clarified that this is the only change under consideration in this motion and that similar updates have already been made elsewhere. Discussion confirmed that the change is intended to update terminology and maintain consistency, and it was noted that there is sensitivity around the language, with agreement to move to the updated term. No further discussion was raised.

**Decision:**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

The Faculty Handbook section concluded with no additional items brought forward. Appreciation was expressed for the extensive work involved in preparing and revising the handbook materials, recognizing the effort as a significant and complex undertaking.

---

**5.B Academic Policies [\(See Appendix A\)](#)**

**Motion 1**

Approve changing the minimum required grade in English 101 and 302 to a C- or better in AP.5.3.2 Requirements for Bachelor's Degrees & 5.3.2.1 English Composition Requirement.

**Discussion:**

The motion proposes changing the minimum required grade in English 101 and 302 from a C to a C- or better. It was noted that this change has been approved by the English department and relevant stakeholders and is intended to simplify processes for students.

Discussion clarified that a C- would count as a passing grade, though it would still carry a lower GPA impact. It was noted that under the current policy, students who earn a C- must retake the course, and the proposed change would remove that requirement. The change was described as addressing a pattern where students repeatedly retake the course, creating a burden for both students and the composition program.

Concerns were raised about whether the change could be seen as grade inflation or a lowering of standards. In response, it was emphasized that students would still receive a lower grade and GPA impact, and that the change primarily allows students to progress without repeating the course. It was also noted that this aligns English 101 and 302 with other Mason Core courses that already accept a C- as passing.

Additional discussion highlighted that a C- is considered a passing level of learning, and requiring students to retake the course after earning a C- can be demoralizing and may hinder progress. It was also noted that departments may still require higher grades for prerequisites, and that performance in composition courses does not always directly translate across disciplines.

Questions were raised about GPA implications and consistency with academic standards. It was noted that GPA reflects overall performance and that many other courses already allow a C- as passing. The requirement for a higher minimum grade in these courses was described as an anomaly, and the proposed change was seen as bringing greater consistency across the curriculum while supporting student progression.

**Decision:**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

**Motion 2**

Approve the revisions/additions to AP.1.8 – Undergraduate Leave of Absence.

**Discussion:**

This motion was presented as an update to better support students who must take a leave of absence due to military service. It was explained that the current policy limits leaves of absence to two years, which can create challenges for students, particularly those at Mason Korea, where military service is often mandatory and may exceed that timeframe. The proposed revision

allows for extended leave in cases of military service and provides clearer guidance for students returning to their studies.

Discussion also clarified that the policy is written broadly and does not restrict eligibility to a specific country's military, ensuring that international students with similar obligations are also covered. The motion was framed as consistent with the university's commitment to supporting military-affiliated students and facilitating their successful return to academic programs. It was also clarified that this change applies to the academic catalog, which governs academic standards and programs, including Mason Korea, and is distinct from the Faculty Handbook. No concerns were raised during discussion.

**Decision:**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

**Motion 3**

Add New AP.1 subsection AP.1.1 Student Status and renumber following sections accordingly.

**Discussion:**

The motion proposes adding a new section to AP1 (AP1.1 Student Status) to define when a student is considered active versus inactive and to renumber the remaining sections accordingly. It was explained that this information is not clearly stated elsewhere in the catalog and would help students better understand their status.

During discussion, a concern was raised that the initial wording could be interpreted to mean that students become inactive during the summer term if they are not enrolled, which is not the intended interpretation. An amendment was proposed to clarify that this excludes summer, revising the language to state that students become inactive in the term immediately following a term where they do not register for classes, excluding summer. It was noted that students are not required to register for summer. The amendment was accepted, with revised language clarifying that students become inactive only if they do not register in a fall or spring term.

Additional discussion highlighted the importance of ensuring clear communication with students, including the need to specify how the university may contact students who are unresponsive to their Mason-issued email accounts. It was noted that the catalog should reflect practical communication methods used by the university. The discussion emphasized clarity and usability of the policy for students navigating their academic status.

**Decision:**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

#### **Motion 4**

Move the paragraph immediately preceding the current AP.1.1 to AP.1.4 Registration Procedures.

#### **Discussion:**

The motion proposes moving a paragraph immediately preceding the newly added AP1.1 section to AP 1.4 (Registration Procedures). It was explained that the paragraph contains information about registration, but is currently placed several sections earlier, which does not align with its content. The change does not involve any edits to the language and is intended only to move the paragraph to the appropriate section for better organization and clarity. No discussion was raised, and the question was called.

#### **Decision:**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

#### **Motion 5**

Approve edits to the first two paragraphs in AP.1.4.

#### **Discussion:**

It was explained that the changes align the language with how registration currently works, including clarifying time ticket assignments based on student level and directing students to consult Patriot Web for information instead of contacting the registrar. Additional edits include updating terminology from “course” to “class,” reflecting that students register for classes, which are the offered sections of courses. The changes were described as minor and largely technical. No further discussion was raised

#### **Decision:**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

#### **Motion 6**

Approve adding new Academic Policy Section AP.8 Non-Degree Academic Credentials.

**Discussion:**

It was explained that these are non-credit-bearing credentials, such as digital badges or micro-credentials, which are not part of academic programs and do not appear on transcripts. The policy is intended to ensure compliance with accreditation and guidance, establish faculty qualifications, clarify assessment requirements, and define approval pathways.

Discussion noted that these credentials are already being offered in various areas, and the policy would provide structure and allow for better oversight. It was emphasized that without such a policy, these activities would continue without Faculty Senate oversight.

Concerns were raised that expanding non-degree credentials could be part of a broader trend that may undermine traditional higher education values. At the same time, it was noted that these credentials are becoming more common and may serve as pathways into degree programs.

Questions were raised about how these credentials relate to credit-bearing programs and whether other types of training could fall under this policy. It was clarified that the policy provides a framework for developing such credentials and ensuring quality and alignment with standards, and that participation would require intentional design within this structure.

Additional discussion emphasized that adopting the policy would allow the Senate to have oversight and a role in defining this space, rather than leaving it unregulated. It was also noted that there is increasing institutional interest in expanding micro-credentials, and that having a policy ensures quality and governance as these efforts grow.

**Decision:**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

**Motion 7**

Approve relocating Academic Standards Policies from their stand-alone position in the catalog into AP.9

**Discussion:**

It was explained that this does not change any language, but rather moves the content so that Academic Standards are formally recognized as an academic policy instead of existing separately. It was noted that Academic Standards are already in place and being enforced, but are not currently under Faculty Senate oversight due to their structure. The change is intended to bring them into the Senate's purview, similar to other recent updates, allowing for oversight and future discussion of the language if needed.

Discussion emphasized that this is part of a broader effort to move existing items into the academic policy structure so they can be reviewed and governed appropriately. It was also noted that while this increases responsibility for the Senate, it allows for greater oversight of important academic matters. Some senators showed strong support for this motion.

**Decision:**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

**Motion 8**

Approve the revisions/additions to AP.9.4 Faculty Responsibilities.

**Discussion:**

The motion proposes revising the timeline for reporting suspected academic standards violations, changing the current deadline from within two months of initial discovery to six weeks. It was explained that the intent is to encourage more timely reporting, as delays have resulted in students being notified of violations long after the incident, creating complications in the process.

Concerns were raised that faculty may need additional time to gather sufficient evidence, particularly in cases involving misuse of AI or complex investigations, and that delays are not always due to inaction. Questions were also raised about the wording “all suspected violations,” with concern that it could imply faculty are required to report every suspicion rather than setting a deadline for formal referrals. Discussion clarified that the intent is to regulate referrals rather than all suspicions, and that current practice allows flexibility, including consultation with the Academic Standards Office. It was also noted that delayed referrals create challenges, including student pushback and delays in academic progression.

An amendment was proposed to revise the language from “all suspected violations” to “any referrals,” and to clarify the reporting expectation. Additional discussion focused on whether the language should use “must” or “should.” It was explained that “should” was preferred to allow flexibility in complex cases, such as extended investigations, late-discovered violations, or technical issues, and to avoid legal or procedural limitations.

Further clarification emphasized that violations do not cease to exist due to timing, and that maintaining flexibility allows the Academic Standards Office to address cases appropriately while still encouraging timely reporting. The amendment was revised to state that “any referrals should be made within six weeks.”

**Decision:**

## Amendment Vote:

- Motion to amend language to “Any referrals to the Academic Standards Office should be made within six weeks” was moved, seconded, and approved by voice vote.

## Main Motion Vote:

- The amended motion was then brought to a vote.
- Motion passed by voice vote.

**Motion 9**

Approve the revisions/additions to AP.9.5 Sanctions.

**Discussion:**

The motion proposes revising sanction thresholds by classifying all violations by undergraduate students with 60 or more completed credits and all graduate students as Level 2 violations. It was explained that the intent is based on student experience and exposure to higher education, and that with required training being implemented, students should be aware of academic standards earlier.

Discussion noted concerns that the current structure may unintentionally favor transfer students or allow a grace period that does not reflect actual experience. It was also explained that the policy aims to reflect overall exposure to higher education rather than time spent specifically at the university. Concerns were also raised that the proposed changes may be too harsh, particularly for first-time violations, and that the policy introduces new sanction structures into the catalog that were not previously included. Additional discussion highlighted cultural differences in understanding academic integrity, especially with issues such as AI, and whether students have sufficient familiarity with institutional expectations.

Questions were also raised about how violations are classified, and it was clarified that the Academic Standards Office determines the level of violation, not faculty. It was further explained that Level 2 violations may result from egregious cases, repeated violations, or sufficient academic experience.

Further discussion included concerns about implementation, including whether the credit threshold is appropriate, how transfer students are treated, and whether the policy should be delayed or revised further. It was also noted that training may play a key role in addressing differences in expectations, particularly for graduate students with prior industry experience.

**Decision:**

- Motion to refer back to the Academic Policies Committee (for further review with Academic Standards Committee) passed by voice vote.

**Motion 10**

Approve the revision to the “Undergraduate Appeals” section of the Student Rights and Responsibilities and minor edit to AP.3.9 Grade Appeals.

**Discussion:**

A motion was made to extend the meeting time to 4:45 PM. The motion was brought to a voice vote and approved, with the majority in favor, allowing the Senate to continue consideration of remaining items.

Motion 10 proposes revising the Undergraduate Appeals section in Student Rights and Responsibilities and making a related edit to AP 3.9 on grade appeals. It was explained that the changes are intended to remove specific references to the Undergraduate Academic Appeals Committee to avoid conflicts with anticipated committee changes in the future.

The proposed language simplifies the existing procedures by stating that specific procedures will be determined by the Undergraduate Council, while still allowing the same processes to occur without being explicitly outlined in the catalog. It was emphasized that this change does not alter policy or procedure but serves as a preparatory step to avoid conflicts when committee changes are implemented later. No discussion was raised.

**Decision:**

- Motion passed by voice vote.

**Post–Business Updates and Discussion from Academic Policies**

A brief recap was provided on prior AP3.3 updates, noting that satisfactory withdrawal was approved, other changes were referred back to committee, and additional items are pending review by the graduate grading task force. It was also shared that a chart has been developed to help clarify grading practices, including which grades affect GPA, appear on transcripts, or are temporary. The chart is intended as a resource for faculty understanding and will be circulated but will not be included in the catalog or affect policy.

A clarification was raised regarding the use of satisfactory withdrawal (SW), noting that it may apply to cases such as switching within the same program rather than moving to a lower program. It was acknowledged that this wording could be updated.

---

## **5.D Budget and Resources**

An update was provided on faculty salary data, noting ongoing coordination due to recent reorganization and that information will be shared once available. It was also noted that the committee expects increased access to financial tools and transparency following an upcoming meeting with the Provost's office.

Discussion addressed broader concerns about the university budget model, including transparency and access to financial data across colleges. It was noted that while some financial information has been shared with deans, it has not yet been broadly shared with faculty. Concerns were raised that this limits faculty understanding and participation in budget-related decisions.

Additional discussion emphasized the importance of sharing a holistic view of the budget model across the university, particularly as it influences college behavior and resource allocation. It was noted that differences in transparency across units may affect how information is communicated, and that greater consistency is needed.

Questions were raised regarding potential future financial challenges, including references to a possible long-term shortfall, while clarifying that the university is not currently operating at a deficit. It was also noted that budget discussions will continue to be a significant issue in the coming year.

---

## **Provost Search Update**

An update was provided on the Provost search, noting that the process is underway, on schedule, and progressing positively. It was also shared that faculty will have opportunities to engage with finalists, and additional information regarding the process will be distributed.

---

## **5.F Nominations Committee**

It was announced that an election slate for Senate Standing Committee members will be presented at the next meeting, and that a call for nominations for faculty representatives to Board of Visitors committees will be distributed soon.

---

### **6.A Policy Management Group**

An update was provided on efforts to revise the university policy process and align academic policies and unit-level documents with the Faculty Handbook. It was noted that work is ongoing to ensure consistency across bylaws, promotion and tenure guidelines, and other policy documents. Faculty representation has been included in the updated process to support broader input and alignment.

---

### **Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The motion was approved by voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 pm.

---

### **Nest Steps**

- Academic Policies Committee
  - Revise and bring back Motion 9 for further review in coordination with the Academic Standards Committee.
- Budget and Resources Committee
  - Continue coordination with Provost's Office to obtain and share faculty salary data.
- Nominations Committee
  - Prepare and present election slate for Senate Standing Committees at the next meeting.
  - Distribute calls for nominations for faculty representatives to Board of Visitors committees.

### **Attendee List**