

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
AGENDA FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
APRIL 2, 2014
Robinson Hall B113, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of the Minutes of March 5, 2014

III. Announcements

President Ángel Cabrera

Provost Peter Stearns

Budget Update

Brief Update on Mason Hall/University Hall Move – Cathy Wolfe, Director, Campus Planning

Length of Summer School

IV. New Business - Committee Reports

A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee

Annual Faculty Senate Evaluation of the President and Provost by Faculty Senate Standing
Committees, University Standing Committees Attachment A

Academic Policies

Budget & Resources

Faculty Matters

Nominations

Keith Renshaw (CHSS) and Esther Elstun (CHSS-emerita) are nominated to serve as Faculty
Senate Representatives to the Technology Leadership Council

Evans Mandes (COS) is nominated to serve as Faculty Senate Representative to Search
Committee for Assistant Vice President/Director of Intercollegiate Athletics

Organization & Operations

B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

Faculty Handbook Committee - Suzanne Slayden, Chair Attachment B

Carnegie Institution Community Engagement Classification Task Force – Janette Muir

V. Other New Business

VI. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty

VII. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT A

Evaluation of the President and Provost by Faculty Senate Standing Committees, University Standing Committees, and Ad Hoc Committees AY 2013-14

responses compiled February-March, 2014

Note that some committees did not provide responses to each question.

1. During the past calendar year has the President or Provost announced initiatives or goals or acted upon issues that fall under the charge of your Committee? If so, was your Committee consulted by the President or Provost in a timely manner before the announcement or action? If not, do you believe your Committee should have been consulted? Would it have been helpful to have had the input of your Committee from the outset?

Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

Academic Policies: Our committee did not have occasion to interact with either the President or the Provost, but we did interact with Associate Provosts. The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education communicated regularly with our committee about the upcoming changes in General Education. The Associate Provost for Graduate Education has agreed to attend AP meetings whenever we discuss graduate matters. There was an issue early in AY 2013-14 because of policies about time limits for PhD students, which were not brought to the AP committee. The Associate Provost met with the Chair of AP and the chair of O&O, and we were satisfied that there would be ways to avoid such problems in the future by having an AP representative on the Graduate Committee and by having the Associate Provost attend our AP meetings.

Budget and Resources: In important ways all changes to the university budget are of significance to the Senate Committee on Budget and Resources. In retrospect, as Chair of the Senate Committee I can see large areas in which as Chair I was remiss in failing to request information re new contracts and expenditures for university wide programs (not individuals, or individual units, which does not fall under the purview of this committee under normal circumstances). The administration cannot be faulted for not answering a question not asked. An example of a decision that impacts the entire university community both financially and for faculty and staff inside the classroom and in the course of student matriculation, is the contract with INTO. The university community was told of the expected enormous budgetary impact (positive) of the agreement signed with INTO, a profit-making company whose job it is to bring international students to matriculate at George Mason for full tuition. These students are allowed entry with lower required scores for entry to GMU and its programs, both on the English language proficiency exam and in overall GPA. The terms of this contract must include costs to the university thus budgetary impact, that given unmet costs, e.g. timely and appropriate faculty raises would have been useful to understand, but as Chair I failed to alert my committee for consultation re an interest in seeing where the costs were. (The shifting of the Mason Inn to serve as INTO dorm space is not included here given that we were provided the information of large losses to the GMU budget already accrued and predicted on the use of the Mason Inn as originally set out). The expectation of the President and Provost's office as stated are clearly on the profit side. The committee was not

consulted on these matters. Presentations by the Provost (and members of his staff) were set out essentially as a fait accompli at Town Hall meetings. It would have been helpful to have a financial breakdown given that the students coming into the university via this route will have a clear (although not exclusive) impact on the faculty in whose classes these students will be placed. The President has not been present at any discussions and has not sought input from the Committee. Although this was set out under the Provost's purview, the President signed the contract. I note the gaps in these kinds of communications as part of this report as a means to set out possible areas of consultation in the future.

Nominations: The Nominations Committee regrets that President Cabrera waited until the Summer to request that Faculty Representatives be elected to the Provost Search Committee. Many Faculty are away during the Summer, and numerous complaints were received about the conduct of the election solely because of the President's inaction. In addition, after the election was rushed to accommodate the President, he took no action to convene the Search Committee until Fall, so this election could easily have been postponed until the start of classes when Faculty had returned. And, indeed, the election could even have been held prior to the end of the Spring semester had President Cabrera informed the Nominations Committee of the number to be elected and had asked for the election to occur. By failing to consult the Nominations Committee about the election, President Cabrera made the Nominations Committee's work difficult and needlessly annoyed many Faculty.

Organization and Operations: The O&O has had no interaction with the President's office this year. The Provost's office has generally been clear and responsive in forwarding issues for consideration by the Senate. The Graduate Provost's decision to make significant policy decisions within the Graduate Council without review by the Senate (i.e. limits on time for graduate degree completion) is disturbing, especially given communication problems with a variety of academic units, but the Graduate Provost willingly met and discussed the issue with representatives from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and indicated there would be greater transparency and online clarification of decisions made.

Responses from the University Standing Committees:

Athletic Council: No, no initiatives or goals for the Athletic Council were initiated by the President or the Provost. We did not have any issues under my charge with either the President or the Provost.

Effective Teaching Committee: NO.

External Academic Relations Committee: The Committee had no interaction with the President or the Provost this year.

Faculty Handbook Committee: The Provost's office has changes it would like to see implemented in the FH and the Provost's representative has brought these issues to the committee for joint discussion.

Grievance Committee: No.

Mason Core Committee: Any initiatives suggested by the President would be related to the Strategic Plan and were vetted by many different committees, with input from leadership familiar with the Mason Core.

The Provost is continually made aware of work that the Mason Core committee is doing and has provided useful input regarding specific changes the committee has encouraged.

Minority and Diversity Issues Committee: As far as I know, the administration has not announced initiatives or goals or acted upon issues that fall under the charge of the Minority and Diversity Issues Committee. And we did not seek any information from them.

Non-Traditional, Interdisciplinary, and Adult Learning Committee: No, no initiatives or goals fell under the charge of this committee in the past calendar year.

Technology Policy Committee: The Technology Policy committee has interacted with the administration on a regular basis. The committee regularly meets with the University's CIO. The CIO always responds to our questions and frequently brings members of her senior staff to respond to our concerns and brainstorm with us on solutions to technology issues affecting faculty.

Writing Across the Curriculum Committee: The WAC committee had little interaction with any administrators other than the ex officio member of the committee, the director of writing across the curriculum admission.

However, the committee feels free to ask for input from the administration and has always received it openly and freely.

2. Did your Committee seek information or input from the President or Provost or members of their staffs? If so, did they respond adequately and in a timely manner?

Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

Academic Policies: See Above.

Budget and Resources: When we sought information from the financial office (JJ Davis, Gil Brown, and Diana Cline, we were provided useful and timely information. Budget and Resources also requests faculty salary information from Human Resources (VP Linda Harber) and that office too complied with our requests.

Nominations: The Nominations Committee thanks Provost Stearns for his cooperative and timely response in making appointments to fill vacancies on committees with a Provost's representative. In every instance, the Provost was prompt and helpful.

Responses from the University Standing Committees:

Athletic Council: No, the committee did not seek specific information from the President or the Provost. I meet with the President annually to provide information on the external oversight of the Intercollegiate Athletic Programs and submit a report on my work as the Faculty Athletic Representative.

Effective Teaching Committee: YES and YES.

Faculty Handbook Committee: Yes. The FH committee regularly meets with a representative from the Provost's office to discuss FH issues of interest to both. All responses were adequate and timely.

Grievance Committee: Yes, The Grievance Committee sought input from both the President and the Provost, and both responded in a timely and complete manner.

Mason Core Committee: The committee continually seeks information from relevant parties in the Provost office. For example, information on course-taking patterns and academic success is garnered from representatives of the Registrar's Office and IRR. The Assessment Office regularly provides data about Mason Core categories and student learning outcomes.

The President's office has been helpful in providing time on the President's calendar to discuss issues related to global understanding and other core competency areas.

Non-Traditional, Interdisciplinary, and Adult Learning Committee: No, the committee did not seek information or input from the president or provost. Our understanding was that this committee has not met for several years and was likely to be dissolved, it is on the list of committees being considered for elimination.

3. Please suggest how you believe the President, Provost and/or their staffs might more effectively interact with your Committee in the future, if necessary.

Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

Academic Policies: Make sure Faculty Senate is informed of upcoming issues that affect faculty across the university so that those issues can be directed to the appropriate committees and forwarded to the Senate for information and/or vote.

Budget and Resources: It would be useful to have more direct knowledge of the generalities of the budget. We talk about transparency, but there are many actions brought in a *pro forma* way to the Senate that have budget implications, yet figures for these large-scale initiatives in a time of declining resources are not shared. I am not setting the Senate Budget and Resources Committee in the place of others who have decision making rights in these arenas, but we do as faculty representatives bear responsibility for knowing and sharing a certain scale of information about the budget and its allocation. There are many instances in which input from faculty, beyond the committee itself, which committee members could be helpful in seeking, would be useful and

provide a sense of community rather than the somewhat adversarial relationship in which we unhappily find ourselves. To these ends, JJ Davis and Guilford Brown have already been particularly willing to be of assistance.

Responses from the University Standing Committees:

Athletic Council: No recommendations. We have established effective interaction and communication. Senior administrators who report to the President, and senior administrators who report to the Provost serve as members of the Athletic Council. They attend regularly and serve on the council's sub-committees.

Effective Teaching Committee: INSTALL A FULL-TIME COMMITTEE MEMBER ON THIS COMMITTEE WHO IS ON THE STAFF OF THE CENTER FOR TEACHING AND FACULTY EXCELLENCE (A MEMBER FROM THAT CENTER HAS SERVED ON THIS COMMITTEE IN THE PAST).

Faculty Handbook Committee: No suggestions for improvement.

Grievance Committee: The Committee feels that the current interactions are effective.

Mason Core Committee: No suggestions.

Non-Traditional, Interdisciplinary, and Adult Learning Committee: I think this committee should be dissolved and another standing committee should be created to address issues related to executive education, professional development, and competency-base education (both for credit and non-credit, across disciplines and trans-disciplinary).

4. Please relate any additional information you may have regarding interactions between your Committee and the President or Provost or their staff.

Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

Budget and Resources: As above.

Responses from the University Standing Committees:

Athletic Council: I am comfortable taking any issue or situation to the President or Provost with regard to student-athlete well being or academic performance. I continue to receive the support necessary to continue in my role as Faculty Athletic Representative and Chair of the Athletic Council.

Effective Teaching Committee: KIM EBY (ASSOCIATE PROVOST FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT) AND KRIS SMITH (ASSOCIATE PROVOST FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH & REPORTING) ATTENDED OUR DECEMBER MEETING AND PROVIDED FEEDBACK ON QUESTIONS REGARDING A PROCESS FOR REVISING THE COURSE EVALUATION FORM.

Faculty Handbook Committee: The FH Committee finds the administrative representatives who meet with the committee to be dedicated and knowledgeable in their areas. They have spent many hours in committee meetings this semester and their efforts have resulted in a much improved Faculty Handbook.

Grievance Committee: No other information is available.

Mason Core Committee: Anyone that we have worked with from the Provost's Office has been helpful, immediately responsive and relevant to our discussions.

Non-Traditional, Interdisciplinary, and Adult Learning Committee: None.

ATTACHMENT B

Faculty Handbook Revision Committee

Proposed Revisions to the Faculty Handbook

April 2, 2014

The Rector has asked the Faculty Senate to revise the Faculty Handbook 1) in the Preface to state the relationship between the Faculty Handbook and the Code of Virginia, and 2) in Chapter 1, **Section 1.2.5** "Faculty Participation in the Selection of Certain Members of the Central Administration".

1)

(1) Preface to the Handbook

The *George Mason University Faculty Handbook* defines and describes the conditions of full-time instructional, research, and clinical faculty employment; the structures and processes through which the faculty participates in institutional decision-making and governance; and the academic policies of the University as established by its Board of Visitors. As an educational institution and executive branch agency of the Commonwealth of Virginia, George Mason University is governed by the Code of Virginia and the general laws of the Commonwealth. Nothing in this Handbook shall be interpreted to be contrary to law, or to regulations and policies of the executive branch of government.

The provisions of the *Faculty Handbook*, as amended from time to time, are incorporated by reference in all full time instructional, research, and clinical faculty employment contracts. These provisions are binding on the University and on individual faculty members. The *Faculty Handbook* governs the employment relationship of individual faculty members, and sets forth the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of faculty members and of the University. Faculty and academic administrators are expected to read the *Faculty Handbook* and to be familiar with its contents.

Note: The proposed language does not affect the application of the University's nondiscrimination policy, which applies to all employees independent of the Handbook.

2) In February, 2013, the Faculty Senate approved revisions to Section 1.2.5; however, these revisions were not submitted to the Board of Visitors for their approval and so do not appear in the current Handbook. Any proposed revision to Section 1.2.5 would be a motion to **"Amend Something Previous Adopted"**.

A motion to amend something previously adopted (a variation on "Rescind") requires a 2/3 vote unless previous notice of the amendment(s) is given, in which case only a majority vote is required for approval. Accordingly, this document will show possible amendments to the 2013 version. (Any other amendments proposed at the meeting, which substantially exceed the scope of these amendments would not have previous notice and thus would require a 2/3 vote.) "Amendments" can be modifications (e.g., insertion, deletion, substitution) or a complete substitution of one version for another. Possible amendments are presented in parts A. and B. below.

Currently approved version, February, 2013:

1.2.5 Faculty Participation in the Selection of Certain Members of the Central Administration

The faculty plays a vital role in the appointment and reappointment of senior academic administrators and other leadership positions related to the academic mission of the university.

The Board of Visitors provides for participation by faculty on presidential search, reappointment, and contract extension committees. A minimum of 25% of the committee **must be** composed of members of the General Faculty, at least half of whom are elected by the General Faculty, with the remainder appointed by the Board of Visitors. No more than **one representative** from any school/college/institute may serve on the committee.

The Board **will make** concerted efforts to further engage the faculty in the selection process (e.g., conducting a survey of faculty regarding desirable characteristics; providing an opportunity for General Faculty or representatives of the General Faculty to meet with finalists). In the case of reappointment or contract extension, this process includes an opportunity for the General Faculty to meet with the President to discuss his or her achievements and future plans for the university.

A.

Possible simple changes to this version:

Para. 2, line 2: strike out “must be” and insert “should be”.

Para. 2, line 4: insert “elected” before “representative” so that it reads “No more than one elected representative....”

Para. 3, line 1: strike out “will make” and insert “should make”.

B.

Possible substitution to this version:

1. Substitute Paragraphs 2 and 3 in the 2013 version, above, with the following (this is essentially a motion to “rescind” since the substitute text is the current Handbook version with a one-word change):

The Board of Visitors provides for participation on presidential search committees by faculty who are elected by the General Faculty. The search and selection process **must include** opportunities for the General Faculty to meet with candidates who are finalists for the presidency.

The Board of Visitors also provides for participation in the process of presidential reappointments or contract extensions by faculty who are elected by the General Faculty. This process includes an opportunity for the General Faculty to meet with the President to discuss his or her achievements and future plans for the university.

2. Amend the motion B.1. above by striking out and inserting as shown below:

The authority to appoint the President of George Mason University is vested in the Board of Visitors. Because the selection of the President is of fundamental importance to the institution, the Board of Visitors provides for participation on the presidential search committees by faculty who are elected by the General Faculty. To ensure the most successful conclusion to the search process, finalist candidates should visit the campuses and meet with the General Faculty. In the event that it is necessary to maintain candidate confidentiality, the search committee and other designated university representatives will meet with the finalists. ~~The search and selection process must include opportunities for the General Faculty to meet with candidates who are finalists for the presidency.~~

The Board of Visitors also provides for participation in the process of presidential reappointments or contract extensions by faculty who are elected by the General Faculty. This process includes an opportunity for the General Faculty to meet with the President to discuss his or her achievements and future plans for the university.

Note: These documents were consulted to ascertain the "best practices" in university presidential searches:

1. "The State University of New York Guide to Presidential Searches at State-Operated Institutions" The guidelines were approved by the State University of New York Board of Trustees, effective January 25, 2012. (http://wings.buffalo.edu/faculty/governance/fac-sen/documents/Guide_Presidential_Search.pdf). This document describes a "representational search" when the names of finalist candidates must be kept confidential.
2. "Presidential Search Committee Checklist" By Muriel E. Poston (<http://aaup.org/issues/governance-colleges-universities/presidential-search>).

See also "A Complete Guide to Presidential Search for Universities and Colleges", By Joseph S. Johnston, Jr. and James P. Ferrare, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, D.C., 2013.