

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
AGENDA FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
APRIL 23, 2014
Robinson Hall B113, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of the Minutes of March 5 and April 2, 2014

III. Announcements

Provost Peter Stearns

Faculty Senators Meeting with Provost-Elect Wu – Thursday, May 22, 2014 at 4:00 p.m.
Carnegie Institution Community Engagement Classification Task Force – Janette Muir

IV. New Business - Committee Reports

A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee

Resolution of Appreciation for Provost Peter Stearns

[Attachment A](#)

Academic Policies

Budget & Resources

Faculty Matters

Nominations

Organization & Operations

Report – O&O Standing Committee Review 2009-2013

[Attachment B1](#)

Recommended Actions: O&O Standing Committee Review 2009-13

[Attachment B2](#)

Amendment to the Charge of the Faculty Handbook

[Attachment C](#)

B. Other Committees - Annual Reports

Senate Standing Committees

[Attachment D](#)

University Standing Committees

[Attachment E](#)

Senate Ad Hoc Committees

[Attachment F](#)

V. Other New Business

Request for Faculty Senate Recommendation for Emeritus/Emerita Rank

[Attachment G](#)

Universal Background Check Report – Jessica Cain, Human Resources

Election of the Faculty Senate Chair 2014-2015

VI. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty

VII. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT A

RESOLUTION of APPRECIATION
for
PROVOST PETER N. STEARNS

WHEREAS Dr. Stearns is stepping down as George Mason University's Provost after fourteen and a half years of devoted service; and

WHEREAS in addition to his time consuming and complicated administrative duties, Dr. Stearns has taught both undergraduate and graduate courses continuously and has achieved an impressive record of research and publication; and

WHEREAS Dr. Stearns has greatly contributed to the transformation of the University as a highly respected academic institution by initiating numerous new degree programs and establishing a global presence for Mason; and

WHEREAS Dr. Stearns has been closely engaged with and involved in the activities and concerns of the Faculty Senate and has conscientiously met with the Senate's Executive Committee; and

WHEREAS Dr. Stearns is returning to the community of scholars as Professor of History,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate expresses its sincere appreciation to Dr. Stearns for his manifold contributions to George Mason University over the years and wishes him well in his role as a member of the Faculty.

ATTACHMENT B1

O&O Standing Committee Review, 2009-2013 April 4, 2014

Overview

The Committee reviewed activity and charges for seven committees, and queried the committees on whether 1) the work of the committee continues to have meaning and significance, 2) if the charge needs modifying, and 3) if there were other changes that they might recommend. After an overview of our recommendations, we provide a series of Action Items for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

A summary of each committee's reports for the last four years, their Charge, their current membership (Faculty Senators in bold), and their responses to the queries is provided below.

Our recommendations, in sum:

*The **Academic Appeals Committee** is only really "publicized" in the University Catalog, and their function is also made fairly specific in the catalog copy. It may be that publicizing the full procedure is something that should be on their agenda for broader dissemination into student information packets and a broader presence on different George Mason University web resources.

*The **Admissions Committee** is conducting their Charge, and this function still has meaning and significance, so there is no change recommended here.

*The **Effective Teaching Committee** desires a clearer Charge, with the ability to look beyond just the University Course evaluations to teaching evaluation and other formative and self-assessment techniques as part of collaborative efforts with the Center for Teaching Excellence and Institutional Research and Reporting. The proposed new Charge offers some greater clarity on these issues.

*The **External Academic Relations Committee** has had a busier year, but their needs have not yet been made clear. On receipt of recommendations from the Committee, O&O will proceed forward at that point.

*The **Grievance Committee** has had an uptick in issues this year, but is currently proceeding on a case-by-case basis. They would appreciate some effort to clarify their procedures in the next round of considerations for Faculty Handbook revisions. No changes recommended by O&O.

*The **Non-Traditional, Interdisciplinary and Adult Learning Committee** has had no referrals this year, and believes the Committee might fruitfully be re-visioned. The laundry list approach has proved less effective for this Committee Charge, and greater focus in an upcoming area of University attention seems warranted. Following their lead, O&O offers the following changes: 1) Change the title to Adult Learning and Executive Education Committee; 2) Change the

Charge to provide greater focus and faculty responsiveness in a key area of the Mason vision and strategic plan.

*The **Salary Equity Study Committee** is still doing a needed job, and would like to slightly expand their impact categories of race, ethnicity, gender and local academic unit and gain flexibility to include “other relevant variables.” O&O recommends this change to their Charge.

The members of the O&O Committee express their appreciation for the work faculty do on University Standing committees, and thank members of the queried committees for their responses. Faculty governance is not easy, nor is it automatic once a committee structure has been established. The spirit of these recommendations is that our process and our work should be as effective and as rewarding as possible, and that regular fine-tuning of our structure helps make that happen.

Lisa Billingham
Arie Croitoru
Bob Dudley
Star Muir (Chair)
Bob Smith

O&O Standing Committee Review, 2009-2013 Recommended Actions

ACADEMIC APPEALS COMMITTEE

No Change in the Charge of the Committee, but query sent to Provost’s Office clarified distribution as simple inclusion in the Catalog (see bracketed material below). Pending clarification of these points, O&O will request distribution of Committee information as indicated in #3 below.

1. The committee members were unanimous in their conviction that the committee continue to exist. Having faculty play this role in governance of the University is very important and should not be relinquished. While discussing this first question, the committee came up with questions of its own: a) What are the procedural guidelines that determine when a case is forwarded to the committee? b) What efforts, if any, are made to inform students and faculty that this committee exists? It is the sense of the committee that most faculty, and probably most students, do not know about this committee or its charge.

[From the University Catalog: Appeals of Academic Procedures

Students have the right to appeal decisions regarding requests for academic actions. The appeals process begins in the academic unit. Each college, school, and institute at Mason has a written statement of that unit’s appeal process on file in the dean or director’s office. Students who feel the appeals process was conducted unfairly by a college or school may appeal to the Provost’s Office. All appeals must be in writing, and they must demonstrate that the student has exhausted all options within the academic unit. Undergraduate students initiate appeals of unit decisions with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. Graduate students initiate appeals of unit decisions with the Associate Provost for Graduate Education. The Provost’s Office does not consider grade appeals or appeals of Honor Committee decisions.

The Provost’s Office may refer cases to the University Academic Appeals Committee. The committee consists of five faculty members, including at least one member of the Faculty Senate and the provost (or designee), who serves ex officio, in a nonvoting capacity. The committee hears only those cases where

procedural irregularities or a questionable application of university policies is demonstrable, or when the provost or the committee deems the case relevant to the application of university-wide policies. The burden of proof rests with the student, who must provide clear and convincing documentation to support the contention that the decision was unfair based on the criteria stated above. The committee's decision is final. The University Academic Appeals Committee is not charged to hear grade appeals or appeals of Honor Committee decisions.

The Provost's Office is responsible for maintaining appeals records, determining whether students have just cause, and ensuring that complete documentation is available for all committee members. The committee communicates its decision to the student, the relevant unit, and the provost.]

2. The committee's response to question 2 above depends, at least in part, on the responses to the two questions that the committee posed in the response to question 1. The committee decided, therefore, to defer its response to question 2 until it has answers to its two questions regarding procedural guidelines for cases being sent to the committee and the means, if any, by which faculty and students are made aware of the committee's existence.
3. The committee members recommend that the information about this committee that is provided on the faculty senate website be included on the Provost's website (if it does not already), the websites of the University's various colleges (if it does not already), and in the student handbooks for all University graduate and undergraduate programs. It is the sense of the committee that most members of the University community are unaware of its existence and that needs to change.

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

Admissions Committee seems to be fulfilling their Charge and need no changes at this time.

Admissions Committee Response:

1. Does the work of the committee continue to have vitality, meaning and significance as part of faculty governance in the University? Should the Committee continue to exist?
We believe that the Admissions Committee is very important and should continue to exist.

EFFECTIVE TEACHING COMMITTEE

Modification and clarification of specific Charge as follows:

Charge:

To develop and help implement procedures which encourage and reward effective teaching, and to enable faculty to improve their teaching effectiveness independent of any evaluation procedures, and to implement procedures or evaluation of effective teaching. Also, to recommend policy to the Senate and to monitor the use of such policy for the evaluation of teachers and courses, including the following:

A. Review existing policies concerned with the evaluation process and as appropriate formulating modifications and additions to these policies and recommending such changes to the Faculty Senate;

B. Review the evaluation form questionnaire at least once every three years and recommending appropriate changes or modifications of the questionnaire and/or procedure to the Faculty Senate; and

C. Inform the Office of Institutional Analysis of policy governing the preparation, administration, and distribution of the results of the GMU Faculty/Course evaluations forms and monitoring the process so as to insure proper application of such policies.

D. Review, in consultation with the Provost's Office, the course evaluation form currently in use, in order to eliminate its ambiguities and perceived deficiencies and to provide for the inclusion of localized

questions by the local academic units; and establish a mechanism for regular review of the course evaluation forms.

A. Review, improve, and provide guidance for Institutional Research and Reporting on the course evaluation form and related procedures at least once every three years;

B. Review existing policies relating to the faculty evaluation process, identify alternatives to these policies and recommend changes to the Faculty Senate;

C. Work closely with the Center for Teaching Excellence to support the use of formative and self-assessment techniques and materials for promoting faculty professional growth and teaching effectiveness, including strategies for robust student feedback.

Rationale: These changes, recommended largely by the Effective Teaching Committee, are a clearer expression of their tasks, and also provide clear direction for examining the larger issues associated with securing feedback for instructional improvement, including formative and self-assessment techniques that go beyond the University course evaluation form.

EXTERNAL ACADEMIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Take no action at this time pending expression of a more specific need for charge revisions. They seem to be a bit busier this year, but we need more focused input before recommending any policy changes.

Comm and charge are fine. However, workload is daunting and doesn't get done. That said, we do more political work than our counterparts at most other VA schools.

1) Does the work of the committee continue to have vitality, meaning and significance as part of faculty governance in the University? Should the committee continue to exist?

The committee should continue to exist. It is the only formal means the faculty senate has of relating to the senates at other VA universities, the Virginia conference of the AAUP, and relevant elected officials.

2) Does the charge of the committee need modifying? Do you have any specific suggestions for changes to the committee charge that would increase the value of the committee or help direct efforts in particular areas?

The charge is fine. It sets out a worthwhile set of tasks, but it is hard to get all the work done. I suspect the mission has never been fully accomplished. I guess it's aspirational.

3) Are there other changes (web presence, information dissemination, faculty handbook requirements, policy clarification, committee structure and composition, etc.) that would increase the effectiveness of the committee?

4) Other comments?

Presently, the Faculty Senate of Virginia is run by one person: Jim Lollar. He personally does a lot of good work, but he's an autocrat, and there's little fun or payoff in attending the FSVA meetings the closest of which are at JMU. This year, and most years, the fall meeting is at Randolph Macon, beginning at 10:00 am. A GMU faculty member has to rise at 5:00, and drive for 5 hours--for a relatively short meeting with little or no chance for meaningful input. It makes more sense to just wait for the email that spells out the bills being proposed by the FSVA for the next legislative session. Then our committee can discuss these with nova legislators who sit on the relevant subcommittees. We've

done that for the last two years. The FSVA and VA-AAUP like this approach because each year we've gotten needed patrons to introduce one or more bills.

GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

Activity has picked up this year, so no substantive changes are proposed. The Committee has expressed a desire for a clarified set of procedures and guidelines in the Faculty Handbook, rather than the current ad-hoc, case-by-case approach. O&O recommends the Faculty Handbook Review Committee address this in the next cycle of revisions.

NON-TRADITIONAL, INTERDISCIPLINARY, and ADULT LEARNING

Since the Committee has had no issues referred to it by O&O for several years (due, in part, to broad overlap with committees like Academic Policies and Faculty Matters), we recommend that 1) The charge be revised to focus on adult learning and executive education, and 2) The Committee be empowered to engage related academic initiatives and issues without having an O&O referral. We recommend the following modifications to the Name and the Charge of the Committee:

Name Change

From: NON-TRADITIONAL, INTERDISCIPLINARY, and ADULT LEARNING

To: ADULT LEARNING and EXECUTIVE EDUCATION

Rationale: Interdisciplinary and Non-traditional categories have not proven fruitful for Faculty Senate oversight within this specifically labeled committee. Many of the cross-unit issues are addressed as Academic Policies, Faculty Matters, or even Academic Initiatives. Adult and executive education, on the other hand, are growing in currency and visibility as part of Mason's vision. It seems worthwhile to take an underutilized group of faculty and refocus their efforts on burgeoning parts of our mission.

Charge Modification

Existing Charge:

To advise and collaborate with the Provost on academic matters on all campuses related to continuing education programs that involve multiple academic units, including approval and oversight of certificates, distance learning courses, summer sessions, contract courses, and the Testing Center.

Modified Charge:

To actively consult with the Provost's Office and the Office of Continuing Professional Education to support, evaluate and refine programs in the areas of adult learning and executive education, including program development, admission policies, awareness programs, online resources, program evaluation, and degree completion initiatives.

Rationale: The laundry list of areas in the title and in the Charge have diminished rather than expanded the effectiveness of the Committee. Refocusing on adult learning and executive education policies and initiatives will help set a structure in place to provide input and faculty decision-making in these key areas of Mason's new vision.

SALARY EQUITY STUDY COMMITTEE

A slight change in the Charge to 1) emphasize the collaborative relationship with relevant units; and 2) slightly broaden the analysis of factors which may impact salary equity.

Revised Charge:

To systematically study annually the distribution of faculty salaries at all ranks as identified in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the Faculty Handbook; to systematically study salaries by gender, by race/ethnic divisions, and by local academic unit, and other variables as may be relevant; to examine frequencies of men/women and of members of different race/ethnic categories within LAUs; and additionally to investigate the potential for individual equity measures. Working with the support of Institutional Research and Reporting and Human Resources, the committee shall monitor the establishment and maintenance of a database of faculty compensation including all categories and ranks of faculty, and shall report its aggregate findings on salary and on the status of the database annually to the Faculty Senate and provide specific data to the Equity Office, the Provost, Deans and Directors, and to other LAU administrators.

ACADEMIC APPEALS COMMITTEE

-none 2013

-none 2012

-1 case 2011

-none 2010

Charge:

To serve as a final locus for appeal of decisions regarding late withdrawal, late add, suspension and dismissal for academic reasons. At its discretion, the Committee may choose to review other individual cases that are relevant to the application of University-wide policies. Does not hear grade appeals or appeals of Honor Committee decisions.

Current Membership (Faculty Senators in Bold):

Michael Hurley (CHSS-2015),*Chair

Sheri Berkeley (CEHD-2014)

Carol Cleaveland (CHHS-2015)

Rutledge Dennis (CHSS-2015)

Kelly Dunne (CHSS-2015)

Peter Pober (CHSS-2014)

Academic Appeals Committee Responses:

1. Does the work of the committee continue to have vitality, meaning and significance as part of faculty governance in the University? Should the Committee continue to exist?
2. Does the charge of the committee need modifying? Do you have any specific suggestions for changes to the committee charge that would increase the value of the committee or help direct efforts in particular areas?
3. Are there other changes (web presence, information dissemination, faculty handbook requirements, policy clarification, committee structure and composition, etc.) that would increase the effectiveness of the committee?

Upon discussion of the above questions, the members of the committee who were present for this meeting developed the following responses in order of the questions:

4. The committee members were unanimous in their conviction that the committee continue to exist. Having faculty play this role in governance of the University is very important and should not be relinquished. While discussing this first question, the committee came up with questions of its own: a) What are the procedural guidelines that determine when a case is forwarded to the committee? b) What efforts, if any, are made to inform students and faculty that this committee exists? It is the sense of the committee that most faculty, and probably most students, do not know about this committee or its charge.
5. The committee's response to question 2 above depends, at least in part, on the responses to the two questions that the committee posed in the response to question 1. The committee decided, therefore, to defer its response to question 2 until it has answers to its two questions regarding procedural guidelines for cases being sent to the committee and the means, if any, by which faculty and students are made aware of the committee's existence.
6. The committee members recommend that the information about this committee that is provided on the faculty senate website be included on the Provost's website (if it does not already), the websites of the University's various colleges (if it does not already), and in the student handbooks for all University graduate and undergraduate programs. It is the sense of the committee that most members of the University community are unaware of its existence and that needs to change.

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

-2013 met 3 times, Dean Takayama-Perez shared information

-2012 report no business, Tallent gave stats

-2011 no business, Tallent gave stats

-2010 one meeting, discussed video essay for applications, Tallent gave stats

Charge:

Follow the admissions process in order that the faculty might better understand it; make recommendations regarding admissions standards to the Director of Admissions; report admissions recommendations and statistics to the Faculty Senate on an annual basis.

Current Membership (Faculty Senators in Bold):

Betsy DeMulder (CEHD–2015), Chair

Marion Deshmukh (CHSS–2015)

Marie Kodadek (CHHS–2015)

Linda Schwartzstein (CHSS–2014)

Susan Tomasovic (CHSS–2014)

Darren Troxler (Interim Associate Dean of Admissions–2015)**

Admissions Committee Response:

2. Does the work of the committee continue to have vitality, meaning and significance as part of faculty governance in the University? Should the Committee continue to exist?
We believe that the Admissions Committee is very important and should continue to exist.

EFFECTIVE TEACHING COMMITTEE

-2013 added CTE non-voting representative, discussed developing faculty and chair guide to interpret/use course evaluations, looking to expand web presence for greater visibility, drafted survey for faculty on course evaluation system

-2012 issues around prof dev, CTE

-2011 reviewed electronic evaluations with IRR

-2010 focused discussion on electronic evaluations

Charge:

To develop and help implement procedures which encourage and reward effective teaching, and to enable faculty to improve their teaching effectiveness independent of any evaluation procedures, and to implement procedures or evaluation of effective teaching. Also, to recommend policy to the Senate and to monitor the use of such policy for the evaluation of teachers and courses, including the following:

A. Review existing policies concerned with the evaluation process and as appropriate formulating modifications and additions to these policies and recommending such changes to the Faculty Senate;

B. Review the evaluation form questionnaire at least once every three years and recommending appropriate changes or modifications of the questionnaire and/or procedure to the Faculty Senate; and

C. Inform the Office of Institutional Analysis of policy governing the preparation, administration, and distribution of the results of the GMU Faculty/Course evaluations forms and monitoring the process so as to insure proper application of such policies.

D. Review, in consultation with the Provost's Office, the course evaluation form currently in use, in order to eliminate its ambiguities and perceived deficiencies and to provide for the inclusion of localized questions by the local academic units; and establish a mechanism for regular review of the course evaluation forms.

Current Membership (Faculty Senators in Bold):

Lorraine Valdez Pierce (CEHD–2015), Chair

John Cantiello (CHHS–2014)

Timothy Curby (CHSS–2014)

Danielle Rudes (CHSS–2015)

Rodger Smith (CHSS–2015)

Ghania Zgheib (ELI–2015)

ETC Response:

1) Does the work of the committee continue to have vitality, meaning and significance as part of faculty governance in the University?

Given the importance of effective teaching in the University's strategic plan, tenure and promotion decisions, professional growth, and the quality of student learning, and as a Committee of the Faculty Senate, we see this Committee as serving faculty by giving voice to each member on how teaching is currently evaluated and how this process can be improved, as well as how to increase teaching effectiveness through feedback and reflection.

We, the members of the Effective Teaching Committee, feel that this Committee should continue to exist with a modified charge, one that enables the Committee to do the following: (1) gather data from a variety of stakeholders on the value of the course evaluation process and (2) provide a forum for faculty to learn about and share how to increase teaching effectiveness.

Recognizing the limitations of the course evaluation form for improvement of faculty teaching, we suggest providing alternative strategies and materials for formative self-assessment of teaching. This

would include disseminating information to faculty with actual examples of how faculty members are using regular student feedback to improve their teaching.

2) Does the charge of the committee need modifying? Do you have any specific suggestions for changes to the committee charge that would increase the value of the committee or help direct efforts in particular areas?

The Committee suggests modifying its charge by aligning the tasks for which it is responsible with the overall goal of improving teaching and learning.

We recommend consolidating the items listed as tasks (A – D) to three tasks as follows:

(1) Review, improve, and provide guidance on the course evaluation form at least once every three (two?) years and existing policies relating to the faculty evaluation process and formulating alternatives to these policies and recommending such changes to the Faculty Senate.

(2) Support the use of formative and self-assessment in promoting faculty professional growth and teaching effectiveness by recommending strategies and materials, including those for student feedback.

3) Are there other changes (web presence, information dissemination, faculty handbook requirements, policy clarification, committee structure and composition, etc.) that would increase the effectiveness of the committee?

The Committee suggests establishing structures that promote two-way communication on a continuing basis and a formal relationship with both the Center for Teaching & Faculty Excellence and the Office of Institutional Research & Reporting. This communication would have as its twin goals reviewing and revising course evaluation forms and improving teaching effectiveness.

We also suggest establishing a web presence for this Committee to disseminate information to faculty on how to use the course evaluation form results to make considered revisions to syllabi and their teaching, as well as how to use a variety of feedback modalities from students – ranging in frequency from weekly to mid-term to engage in reflection and self-evaluation as parts of formative assessment. The web site could also provide a forum for faculty to post questions or comments or engage in dialogue with other faculty.

EXTERNAL ACADEMIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

-2013 met 4 times, met with delegates and senators from Northern Virginia, didn't attend meetings of the Faculty Senate of Virginia or Higher Education Advocacy Day, but did participate in the Mason Lobby Day, proposed that Mason faculty meet more frequently with Northern Virginia legislators.

-2012 nothing

-2011 met twice with Jolly

-2010 meet 3 times, plan to make recommendations to improve committee

Charge:

A. Represent GMU faculty at Virginia higher education faculty governance organizations, including the Faculty Senate of Virginia. The seats allocated to GMU at the Faculty Senate of Virginia are to be filled by members of CEAR.

B. Report to the GMU faculty senate on the proceedings of the Virginia Faculty Senate and voice back to this organization issues of relevance to GMU.

C. Gather information on key matters about higher education in state legislation, state committees, and local venues, and report back to the GMU Senate.

D. Provide forums and avenues for the exchange of ideas with representatives of SCHEV, state legislators representing Northern Virginia, and community groups related to higher education in Northern Virginia.

Current Membership (Faculty Senators in Bold):

Alok Berry (VSE-2015), Co-chair

David Kuebrich (CHSS-2014), Co-chair

Changwoo Ahn (COS-2015)

Mike Dickerson (CHSS-2014)

John Riskind (CHSS-2014)

Pierre Rodgers (CEHD-2015)

Lesley Smith (CHSS-2014)*

Comm and charge are fine. However, workload is daunting and doesn't get done. That said, we do more political work than our counterparts at most other VA schools.

1) Does the work of the committee continue to have vitality, meaning and significance as part of faculty governance in the University? Should the committee continue to exist?

The committee should continue to exist. It is the only formal means the faculty senate has of relating to the senates at other VA universities, the Virginia conference of the AAUP, and relevant elected officials.

2) Does the charge of the committee need modifying? Do you have any specific suggestions for changes to the committee charge that would increase the value of the committee or help direct efforts in particular areas?

The charge is fine. It sets out a worthwhile set of tasks, but it is hard to get all the work done. I suspect the mission has never been fully accomplished. I guess it's aspirational.

3) Are there other changes (web presence, information dissemination, faculty handbook requirements, policy clarification, committee structure and composition, etc.) that would increase the effectiveness of the committee?

4) Other comments?

Presently, the Faculty Senate of Virginia is run by one person: Jim Lollar. He personally does a lot of good work, but he's an autocrat, and there's little fun or payoff in attending the FSVA meetings the closest of which are at JMU. This year, and most years, the fall meeting is at Randolph Macon, beginning at 10:00 am. A GMU faculty member has to rise at 5:00, and drive for 5 hours--for a relatively short meeting with little or no chance for meaningful input. It makes more sense to just wait for the email that spells out the bills being proposed by the FSVA for the next legislative session. Then our committee can discuss these with nova legislators who sit on the relevant subcommittees. We've done that for the last two years. The FSVA and VA-AAUP like this approach because each year we've gotten needed patrons to introduce one or more bills.

GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

-2013 received one grievance, forwarded compliance recommendation to President

-2012 nothing

-2011 no report

-2010 no cases

Charge:

To investigate grievances of tenured, tenure-track, and term faculty:

A. which involve faculty matters from more than one local academic unit. Issues of investigation include alleged infringements of academic freedom, alleged unfair or inappropriate conditions of employment, alleged unfair or inappropriate termination for cause, and any other due process issue with the exclusion of retention, promotion and tenure appeals; (See also Faculty Handbook Section 2.93 Termination of Appointment for Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Term Faculty Members for Cause (pp. 47-49)).

B. which are not addressed by, or do not fall within the purview of the grievance committee of the pertinent local academic unit; (See also Faculty Handbook Section 2.10.1 University Policies (p. 48)) and

C. for local academic units that do not have grievance committees established, or when a grievance committee does not conform to the written procedures of the local academic unit. Other faculty appeals from local academic unit grievance committees are excluded. (See also Faculty Handbook Section 2.10.3 Faculty Work Assignments (p. 49) in case where Grievance is against a dean or director).

D. which involve administrators at or above the level of Dean or Director. (See also Faculty Handbook Sections 2.11.2 Grievances, 2.11.2.1 Policies Concerning Grievances, 2.11.2.2 Grievance Procedures (pp. 53-54)).

Current Membership (Faculty Senators in Bold):

Paul Houser (COS–2014), Chair

Rick Coffinberger (SOM–2015)

Doris Bitler Davis (CHSS–2014)

Mike O’Malley (CHSS–2014)

Joe Scimecca (CHSS–2015)

Grievance Committee Responses:

1) Does the work of the committee continue to have vitality, meaning and significance as part of faculty governance in the University? Should the committee continue to exist?

Yes and Yes – we have been very active this year, handling 4 formal, and 1 informal grievances. Our committee seems to be very relevant and addressing tough issues.

2) Does the charge of the committee need modifying? Do you have any specific suggestions for changes to the committee charge that would increase the value of the committee or help direct efforts in particular areas?

No and Yes – I think it would be useful for the Faculty handbook to provide specific procedures or guidelines on how the committee should conduct its investigations. We are currently using an ad-hoc, case-by-case procedure.

3) Are there other changes (web presence, information dissemination, faculty handbook requirements, policy clarification, committee structure and composition, etc.) that would increase the effectiveness of the committee? No

4) Other comments? None

NON-TRADITIONAL, INTERDISCIPLINARY, and ADULT LEARNING

-2013 nothing

-2012 nothing

-2011 met once, discussed myriad issues, felt need for a fuller vision for NIAL

-2010 met once, no business

Charge:

To advise and collaborate with the Provost on academic matters on all campuses related to continuing education programs that involve multiple academic units, including approval and oversight of

certificates, distance learning courses, summer sessions, contract courses, and the Testing Center.

Current Membership (Faculty Senators in Bold):

Nada Dabbagh (CEHD–2014), Chair

Kathryn Jacobsen (CHHS–2014)

Jeng-Eng Lin (COS–2015)

Kristin Scott (CHSS–2015)

Karen Studd (CVPA–2015)

NIAL Response:

Question 1) NO

Question 2) YES

Question 3) NO

Question 4) Here are some comments from previous committee members:

My understanding is that the committee has not met for several years and was likely to be dissolved – it is on the list of committees being considered for deletion or elimination, not because NIAL issues are not important but because with more than 20 Faculty Senate and university faculty standing committees there are considerable overlaps in mandates. The "O&O" (Organization and Operations) committee of Faculty Senate is looking for ways to streamline committee assignments, reduce redundancies, and ensure that all standing committees are able to contribute to the university in a meaningful way each year.

No issues have been raised in the Faculty Senate that were referred to this committee in the last several years. Having said this however, everything in the academic communities shows trends moving more and more to cross disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary, executive education, and professional development. Perhaps this committee ought to be reinvented under a different name “executive education committee” or something similar.

SALARY EQUITY STUDY COMMITTEE

- 2013 no report submitted
- 2012 couldn't get data?
- 2011 met every 2 months, discussed data analysis plan
- 2010 met once, felt analysis not warranted since no raises

Charge:

To systematically study annually the distribution of faculty salaries at all ranks as identified in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the Faculty Handbook; to systematically study salaries by gender, by race/ethnic divisions, and by local academic unit; to examine frequencies of men/women and of members of different race/ethnic categories within LAUs; and additionally to investigate the potential for individual equity measures. The committee shall monitor the establishment and maintenance of a database of faculty compensation including all categories and ranks of faculty, and shall report its aggregate findings on salary and on the status of the database annually to the Faculty Senate and provide specific data to the Equity Office, the Provost, Deans and Directors, and to other LAU administrators.

Current Membership (Faculty Senators in Bold):

Penelope Earley (CEHD-2015)*

Margret Hjalmarson, Chair (CEHD-2015)

Eden King (CHSS-2014)

Rory Muhammad (Associate Director, Equity and Diversity Services-2015)***

Lesley Smith (CHSS-2014)

Monique Van Hoek (COS-2015); Catherine Wright (CHSS-2014)

SESC Response:

1. Yes, faculty salary equity is still and will always be an issue that needs to be monitored, analyzed and assessed.

2. As for the charge, it currently states "to systematically study salaries by gender, by race/ethnic divisions, and by local academic unit". I would modify to read as-

to systematically study salaries by gender, by race/ethnic divisions, by local academic unit, and other variables as may be relevant.

I suggest this because we are working to study compression issues for salary that are at the moment obliquely relevant, but not specifically within the charge. There may be other such concerns that emerge over time.

3. The support of the IRR office and HR is indispensable to our work as a committee. I don't think we need membership on the committee from those offices, but it may need to be included in the charge that we have support from them. We have received a great deal of help from them so it is not a negative commentary rather that it should perhaps be acknowledged. Maybe ex officio membership?

ATTACHMENT B2

O&O Standing Committee Review, 2009-2013

Recommended Actions

ACADEMIC APPEALS COMMITTEE

No Change in the Charge of the Committee, but query sent to Provost's Office clarified distribution as simple inclusion in the Catalog (see bracketed material below). Pending clarification of these points, O&O will request distribution of Committee information as indicated in #3 below.

7. The committee members were unanimous in their conviction that the committee continue to exist. Having faculty play this role in governance of the University is very important and should not be relinquished. While discussing this first question, the committee came up with questions of its own: a) What are the procedural guidelines that determine when a case is forwarded to the committee? b) What efforts, if any, are made to inform students and faculty that this committee exists? It is the sense of the committee that most faculty, and probably most students, do not know about this committee or its charge.

[From the University Catalog: Appeals of Academic Procedures

Students have the right to appeal decisions regarding requests for academic actions. The appeals process begins in the academic unit. Each college, school, and institute at Mason has a written statement of that unit's appeal process on file in the dean or director's office. Students who feel the appeals process was conducted unfairly by a college or school may appeal to the Provost's Office. All appeals must be in writing, and they must demonstrate that the student has exhausted all options within the academic unit. Undergraduate students initiate appeals of unit decisions with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. Graduate students initiate appeals of unit decisions with the Associate Provost for Graduate Education. The Provost's Office does not consider grade appeals or appeals of Honor Committee decisions.

The Provost's Office may refer cases to the University Academic Appeals Committee. The committee consists of five faculty members, including at least one member of the Faculty Senate and the provost (or designee), who serves ex officio, in a nonvoting capacity. The committee hears only those cases where procedural irregularities or a questionable application of university policies is demonstrable, or when the provost or the committee deems the case relevant to the application of university-wide policies. The burden of proof rests with the student, who must provide clear and convincing documentation to support the contention that the decision was unfair based on the criteria stated above. The committee's decision is final. The University Academic Appeals Committee is not charged to hear grade appeals or appeals of Honor Committee decisions.

The Provost's Office is responsible for maintaining appeals records, determining whether students have just cause, and ensuring that complete documentation is available for all committee members. The committee communicates its decision to the student, the relevant unit, and the provost.]

8. The committee's response to question 2 above depends, at least in part, on the responses to the two questions that the committee posed in the response to question 1. The committee decided, therefore, to defer its response to question 2 until it has answers to its two questions regarding procedural guidelines for cases being sent to the committee and the means, if any, by which faculty and students are made aware of the committee's existence.
9. The committee members recommend that the information about this committee that is provided on the faculty senate website be included on the Provost's website (if it does not already), the

websites of the University's various colleges (if it does not already), and in the student handbooks for all University graduate and undergraduate programs. It is the sense of the committee that most members of the University community are unaware of its existence and that needs to change.

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

Admissions Committee seems to be fulfilling their Charge and need no changes at this time.

Admissions Committee Response:

3. Does the work of the committee continue to have vitality, meaning and significance as part of faculty governance in the University? Should the Committee continue to exist?
We believe that the Admissions Committee is very important and should continue to exist.

EFFECTIVE TEACHING COMMITTEE

Modification and clarification of specific Charge as follows:

Charge:

To develop and help implement procedures which encourage and reward effective teaching, and to enable faculty to improve their teaching effectiveness independent of any evaluation procedures, and to implement procedures or evaluation of effective teaching. Also, to recommend policy to the Senate and to monitor the use of such policy for the evaluation of teachers and courses, including the following:

- A. Review existing policies concerned with the evaluation process and as appropriate formulating modifications and additions to these policies and recommending such changes to the Faculty Senate;*
- B. Review the evaluation form questionnaire at least once every three years and recommending appropriate changes or modifications of the questionnaire and/or procedure to the Faculty Senate; and*
- C. Inform the Office of Institutional Analysis of policy governing the preparation, administration, and distribution of the results of the GMU Faculty/Course evaluations forms and monitoring the process so as to insure proper application of such policies.*
- D. Review, in consultation with the Provost's Office, the course evaluation form currently in use, in order to eliminate its ambiguities and perceived deficiencies and to provide for the inclusion of localized questions by the local academic units; and establish a mechanism for regular review of the course evaluation forms.*

[A. Review, improve, and provide guidance for Institutional Research and Reporting on the course evaluation form and related procedures at least once every three years;](#)

[B. Review existing policies relating to the faculty evaluation process, identify alternatives to these policies and recommend changes to the Faculty Senate;](#)

[C. Work closely with the Center for Teaching Excellence to support the use of formative and self-assessment techniques and materials for promoting faculty professional growth and teaching effectiveness, including strategies for robust student feedback.](#)

Rationale: These changes, recommended largely by the Effective Teaching Committee, are a clearer expression of their tasks, and also provide clear direction for examining the larger issues associated with securing feedback for instructional improvement, including formative and self-assessment techniques that go beyond the University course evaluation form.

EXTERNAL ACADEMIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Take no action at this time pending a Committee response to O&O queries. They seem to be a bit busier this year, but we need more input before recommending any policy changes.

No Committee response as of 4/3/14

GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

Activity has picked up this year, so no substantive changes are proposed. The Committee has expressed a desire for a clarified set of procedures and guidelines in the Faculty Handbook, rather than the current ad-hoc, case-by-case approach. O&O recommends the Faculty Handbook Review Committee address this in the next cycle of revisions.

NON-TRADITIONAL, INTERDISCIPLINARY, and ADULT LEARNING

Since the Committee has had no issues referred to it by O&O for several years (due, in part, to broad overlap with committees like Academic Policies and Faculty Matters), we recommend that 1) The charge be revised to focus on adult learning and executive education, and 2) The Committee be empowered to engage related academic initiatives and issues without having an O&O referral. We recommend the following modifications to the Name and the Charge of the Committee:

Name Change

From: NON-TRADITIONAL, INTERDISCIPLINARY, and ADULT LEARNING

To: ADULT LEARNING and EXECUTIVE EDUCATION

Rationale: Interdisciplinary and Non-traditional categories have not proven fruitful for Faculty Senate oversight within this specifically labeled committee. Many of the cross-unit issues are addressed as Academic Policies, Faculty Matters, or even Academic Initiatives. Adult and executive education, on the other hand, are growing in currency and visibility as part of Mason's vision. It seems worthwhile to take an underutilized group of faculty and refocus their efforts on burgeoning parts of our mission.

Charge Modification

Existing Charge:

To advise and collaborate with the Provost on academic matters on all campuses related to continuing education programs that involve multiple academic units, including approval and oversight of certificates, distance learning courses, summer sessions, contract courses, and the Testing Center.

Modified Charge:

To work with the Provost's Office and the Office of Continuing Professional Education to support, evaluate and refine programs in the areas of adult learning and executive education, including program development, admission policies, awareness programs, online resources, program evaluation, and degree completion initiatives.

Rationale: The laundry list of areas in the title and in the Charge have diminished rather than expanded the effectiveness of the Committee. Refocusing on adult learning and executive education policies and initiatives will help set a structure in place to provide input and faculty decision-making in these key areas of Mason's new vision.

SALARY EQUITY STUDY COMMITTEE

A slight change in the Charge to 1) emphasize the collaborative relationship with relevant units; and 2) slightly broaden the analysis of factors which may impact salary equity.

Revised Charge:

To systematically study annually the distribution of faculty salaries at all ranks as identified in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the Faculty Handbook; to systematically study salaries by gender, by race/ethnic divisions, ~~and~~ by local academic unit, and other variables as may be relevant; to examine frequencies of men/women and of members of different race/ethnic categories within LAUs; and additionally to investigate the potential for individual equity measures. Working with the support of Institutional Research and Reporting and Human Resources, the committee shall monitor the establishment and maintenance of a database of faculty compensation including all categories and ranks of faculty, and shall report its aggregate findings on salary and on the status of the database annually to the Faculty Senate and provide specific data to the Equity Office, the Provost, Deans and Directors, and to other LAU administrators.

ATTACHMENT C

Amendment to the Charge of the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee

Existing Charge

Faculty Handbook Revision Committee
(Approved by the Faculty Senate April 28, 2010)

The Organization and Operations Committee moves that the Faculty Senate establish a Faculty Handbook Revision Committee consisting of three tenured members of the instructional faculty, at least one of whom must be a Senator, to consider changes to the Faculty Handbook and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

Proposed changes may be brought to the Committee by any member of the faculty, administration, or Visitor. The Committee is charged to confer with appropriate members of the administration during consideration of any change.

In order to maintain continuity, members of this Committee shall have staggered terms of one, two, and three years.

Proposed Change

The Organization and Operations Committee moves that the Faculty Senate establish a Faculty Handbook Revision Committee consisting of three tenured members of the instructional faculty, at least one of whom must be a Senator, to consider changes to the Faculty Handbook and make recommendations *every three years (if necessary)* to the Faculty Senate.

ATTACHMENT D

ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES 2013-2014

1. Academic Policies – Suzanne Scott (CHSS), Chair

Committee Members: Dominique Banville (CEHD), Yvonne Demory (SOM – Sept. – Nov. 2013), Helen Frederick (CVPA), Timothy Leslie (COS), Frank Allen Philpot (SOM – Dec. 2013-)

During the 2013-2014 academic year, the Academic Policies committee focused on three main topics. The summaries below indicate topics brought to the Senate and those being discussed in committee meetings.

Our committee had two separate members from the School of Management who felt they needed to withdraw from the Senate and consequently from the AP Committee, so we were operating with fewer members than normal for part of the year. Committee members included Suzanne Scott, chair; Dominique Banville, Helen Frederick, Timothy Leslie, and Frank Allen Philpot.

1. Academic Calendars

- **Regular Academic-Year Calendar.** The committee approved the Academic Calendar presented by the registrar's office for 2017-18. Last year the decision was made to approve one year at a time.
 - **Summer Calendar.** The committee approved the summer tentative schedules during the 12-13 AY, knowing that there would be some final changes because of requirements of financial aid. When this issue came up in the middle of the spring semester, our committee was not involved in the process. The issue was taken up by the Senate as a whole.

2. General Education Changes.

- a. General Education to Mason Core.** During the fall semester, Janette Muir, Associate Provost, met with the committee to let us know of proposed changes coming to the committee and to the Senate. Our committee approved the name change, and the change was approved by the Senate.
- b. Double counting of up to 6 credits.** The Mason Core committee voted to allow students to double count up to 6 credits in Mason Core categories. Categories *restricted* from double counting would be: Quantitative Reasoning, Oral Communication, and Written Communication (lower and upper level) since these are viewed as foundational areas of the Core. The changes were brought to the Academic Policies Committee, which we voted to approve. The faculty Senate approved the following changes.

“University General Education is divided into three sections: foundation, core and synthesis. Each section contains courses that have specific learning outcomes for students and are assessed on a regular basis. **In some instances, student may be able to double-count courses that meet the learning outcomes for more than one category (maximum 6 credits). Courses that apply to more than one category are indicated on the full Mason Core list.**”

3. Catalog Changes.

- a. **Non-Degree Status.** The committee brought forth a change maximum number of credits in non-degree status **from 18 credits to 30.** “At least one-fourth of the total credits applied to the degree must be completed at Mason and include at least 12 upper-level credits (courses numbered 300 or above) in the major program. A maximum of **30 credits** earned in non-degree status at Mason can be applied toward a bachelor’s degree.” That change was approved by the Senate.
- b. **Leave-of-Absence Policy.** The committee met with Dawn Anderson and others from the Registrar’s office in order to understand the importance of a codified leave-of-absence policy for students. The committee determined that faculty would not in any way be negatively affected by the policy and that the policy could help a great deal in the retention of students. By allowing them access to their Mason email accounts, the library and other services at Mason, students would be less likely to disappear. The committee took it to the Senate for a vote, and it passed unanimously.

2. Budget and Resources – Susan Trencher (CHSS), Chair

Committee Members: Yvonne Demory (SOM – Sept-Nov. 2013), Janos Gertler (VSE), Mark Houck (VSE – Nov. 2013-), June Tangney (CHSS), Jenice View (CEHD)

Annual Report Budget and Resources AY 2013-2014

Chair, Susan Trencher (CHSS)

Members: Janos Gertler (VSE); Mark Houck (VSE) June Tangney (CHSS) Jenice View (CEHD)

Budget and Resources requested and received Faculty Salary data from Human Resources and the university Office of Budget and Planning. This material was duly posted as is done annually, on the Faculty Senate website. As stated in the committee summary for AY 2012-2013, meetings were scheduled to make this process less cumbersome for all involved than has previously been the case. This was duly addressed, and this year the process went more smoothly. No other business was assigned through Faculty Senate O&O.

3. Faculty Matters – Joe Scimecca (CHSS), Chair

Committee Members: Mark Addleson (SPP), Doris Bitler Davis (CHSS), Paula Petrik (CHSS), Keith Renshaw (CHSS)

The Senate Faculty Matters Committee undertook two major projects.

1. A letter was sent out to all full-time faculty on behalf of the Senate Faculty Matters Committee and the Senate Budget and Resources Committee inquiring as to whether anyone had been denied the opportunity to teach as summer school class for 10% of their annual salary as stated in the Faculty Handbook. I am happy to report that there were no violations reported to the Committees.
2. The Faculty Matters Committee sent out the results of the 2012-2013 Administration Evaluation Survey, with summaries of the qualitative remarks submitted by faculty. It also sent out the 2013-2014 survey.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Scimecca

Chair, Senate Faculty Matters Committee

4. Nominations – Jim Bennett (CHSS), Chair

Committee Members: Rick Coffinberger (SOM), Mark Houck (VSE), Linda Monson (CVPA), Peter Pober (CHSS)

The Faculty Senate Nominations Committee has conscientiously nominated candidates for every vacancy that has arisen throughout AY 2013-2014.

5. Organization and Operations – Star Muir (CHSS), Chair

Committee Members: Lisa Billingham (CVPA), Arie Croitoru (COS), Bob Dudley (CHSS), Bob Smith (CHSS)

Report of the Organization and Operations Committee of the George Mason University Faculty Senate 2013-2014

Committee: Lisa Billingham, Arie Croitoru, Bob Dudley, Star Muir (Chair), Bob Smith

O&O allocated issues to Faculty Senate and University Committees, with a clear logging process that indicated the Senate received fourteen (14) issues for consideration this year (see attached log).

Specific Issues Addressed by O&O

1) Composition of External Academic Affairs Committee

O&O solicited input, and revised the composition to allow non-senators to serve.

2) Allotment of senate slots to academic units.

Based on instructional FTE data from Institutional Research and Reporting, there was no change in the allotment of slots for 2013-2014.

3) Examination of load and activity for University Standing Committees

After a preliminary survey, seven committees were identified as having little or no work load based on reports from the last four years. The seven identified committees (reviewed for 2009-2013 reports) are: Academic Appeals, Admissions, Effective Teaching, External Academic Relations, Grievance, Non-traditional, Interdisciplinary and Adult Learning, and Salary Equity Study. O&O gathered information from the committees and has recommended changes to the Charge of the Effective Teaching Committee, a slight modification of the Charge for the Salary Equity Study Committee, and a Title and Charge change for the Non-Traditional, Interdisciplinary and Adult Learning Committee.

See [Attachment B1](#) for the full text of the Report: Review of Standing Committees 2009-2013.

See [Attachment B2](#) for the full text of Recommended Actions.

Log Number	Issue	Submitter	Date	Sent To	Information	Final Resolution
FS1314.001	Approval schedule/deadlines for catalog	Colleen Bauer	6/20/2013	Academic Policies		Approved
FS1314.002	Composition of External Academic Relations Com	James Bennett	7/2/2013	O&O	Why must every member be a Senator?	Amendment approved on the floor of the Senate
FS1314.003	Complaints about new e-mail system	James Bennett	8/23/2013	Tech Policy Committee		Acting CIO reported to Senate
FS1314.004	Dir of State Govt Relations on Ext Academic Relatio	James Bennett	8/29/2013	O&O		O&O query to Provost indicated membership was voluntary
FS1314.005	Continuing Registration credits for Graduate studen	Tim Leslie	9/23/2013	Academic Policies		Withdrawn
FS1314.006	In Residence credit requirement to change programs a	Tim Leslie	9/23/2013	Academic Policies		Withdrawn
FS1314.007	WAC Committee Co-Chairs?	Stanley Zoltek	10/2/2013	O&O		O&O ruled could do co-chairs under the current Charge to WAC
FS1314.008	Time Limit for Graduate Degree Completion	Brian Platt	10/12/2013	EXC/Academic Policies	Discussed with Cody Edwards, Graduate Provost, who m	EXC representatives asked for better communication of Graduate Council decisions and emphasized the need for a representative on the Graduate Council from the AP Committee
FS1314.009	Summer school teaching	Susan Trencher	11/3/2013	Faculty Matters		Few responses/complaints to queries
FS1314.010	Change GenEd Committee title to Mason Core	Janette Muir	11/15/2013	O&O		Approved by Faculty Senate
FS1314.011	Add Capstone to Mason Core	Mason Core Committe	11/15/2013	Academic Policies		Senate tabled motion
FS1314.012	Residency requirement	Janette Muir	11/15/2013	Academic Policies		Approved by Faculty Senate
FS1314.013	Undergraduate Leave of Absence policy	Brian Selinsky	1/17/2014	Academic Policies		Approved by Faculty Senate
FS1314.014	Double Counting credits in the Mason Core	Janette Muir	1/28/2014	Academic Policies		Approved by Faculty Senate
FS1314.015						
FS1314.016						
FS1314.017						
FS1314.018						
FS1314.019						

ATTACHMENT E

ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE UNIVERSITY STANDING COMMITTEES 2013-14

1. ACADEMIC APPEALS – Michael Hurley (CHSS), Chair

Committee Members: Sheri Berkeley (CEHD), Carol Cleaveland (CHHS), Rutledge Dennis (CHSS), Kelly Dunne (CHSS), Peter Pober (CHSS).

The Academic Appeals Committee held only one meeting during the 2013/2014 academic year, the purpose of which was to consider questions posed to us by Star Muir on behalf of the university's Organization & Operations Committee.

2. ACADEMIC INITIATIVES – Hugh Sockett (CHSS), Chair

Committee Members: Craig Esherick (CEHD), Steven Rose (CHHS), Anne Schiller (Vice President, Global and International Strategies, *ex-officio*), Iosif Vaisman (COS), Anand Vidyashankar (VSE).

ACADEMIC INITIATIVES COMMITTEE: Report to Senate April, 2014

Members: Hugh Sockett (CHSS, chair), Craig Esherick (CEHD), Steven Rose (CHHS), Anne Schiller (VP, Global and International Strategies, *ex-officio*), Iosif Vaisman (COS), Anand Vidyashankar (VSE).

The Committee met on April 7 and will meet again on May 5. The delay was due to a delay in the selection of a convener.

At the April meeting, the Committee reviewed its charge, and noted its history. It is concerned that its deliberations do not overlap with the responsibilities of other committees.

The Committee received an overview of the proposed merger of SPP and PIA in the creation of a new School. (see attached) and understands a decision will be made before the end of the semester.

The Committee agreed to review the following initiatives as an agenda for the next academic year and to invite appropriate University personnel as appropriate to present:

- a. INTO,
- b. Global Strategic Planning, specifically on partnerships, (Anne Schiller to circulate information)
- c. Regional Campuses,
- d. Distance Education,
- e. Planned and Proposed new Institutes, specifically Medical Research and Health Science, Simulation and Gaming, and others.
- f. Mason Korea achievements.

Academic Initiatives Committee Report (04/07/14: attached 1)

The Creation of the School of Policy, Politics and International Affairs (SPPIA) through the merger of the School of Public Policy and the CHSS Department of Public and International Affairs

This Overview reflects a process of deliberation and negotiation between the two faculties, President, Provost, CHSS Dean and the Budget Office. It is anticipated, though not yet confirmed, that the Proposal will be put to the BOV at its May meeting.

I. THE END-STATE

Objectives:

1. Clarify, unify, and strengthen Mason's identity and image in public policy, governance and international affairs as perceived internally and externally (e.g. potential students, prospective donors, media, policy-makers, etc.)
2. Expand opportunities for innovative research, service, and executive training through greater collaboration among faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, and staff.
3. Improve learning by coordinating cognate programs, sharing educational resources, and building a larger and stronger graduate and undergraduate student community.
4. Enhance efficiency of course offerings and administrative support services (recruitment, marketing, communications, etc.).
5. Build the preeminent professional school in the National Capital Region for the region's most important industry: governing.

Structure:

- SPPIA will be an LAU with a Dean, an Executive Committee, and 3 or 4 Divisions to be determined during the transition period (see below).
- Faculty will choose a primary affiliation to a Division, and will participate in School and Division governance.
- Chairs of Division, usually also directors of Programs, will be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Executive Committee, representative of faculty.
- Promotion and tenure arrangements, and faculty hires will meet Faculty Handbook regulations.
- Curriculum matters will be determined by Division faculty, and curriculum committees will be established for the purposes of the transition and thereafter.

II. THE TRANSITION

- The School will open at the beginning of FY2015 with the appointment of a new Dean to be in office by FY2016.
- For FY2015, there will be an interim Dean and two acting senior associate deans. A Transitional Executive Council will govern the affairs of the School.
- The schedule of integration is speculative as of April 2014.
- Full integration of faculty hiring, curriculum planning, admissions, research administration and other matters will take place in FY 2015, followed by integration of P&T, HR and development in FY 2016.
- Faculty Committees will be representative of the two pre-merger units: New By-Laws, Research, Graduate and Undergraduate Programs, social activities and cultural integration. The Divisional Structure and Curriculum will also be examined.
- For the first two years, faculty will teach in the same programs and locations unless there are agreed arrangements for change.

- In the first five years, SPPIA will develop principles to guide salary decisions in consultation with Mason's administration and will take action to address salary inequities resulting from existing differences in the two merged units.
- Candidates for tenure up to FY2018 will be reviewed according to the procedures in the School in which they were originally hired, unless a candidate chooses to be reviewed under new by-laws.

3. ADMISSIONS - Betsy DeMulder (CEHD), Chair

Committee Members: Marion Deshmukh (CHSS), Marie Kodadek (CHHS), Linda Schwartzstein (CHSS), Susan Tomasovic (CHSS), Darren Troxler (Interim Associate Dean of Admissions). We met (over email) to designate a chair but we have not had any business and so have not had any subsequent meetings.

4. ATHLETIC COUNCIL – Linda Miller (CEHD), Faculty Athletic Representative, Chair

Committee Members: Amanda Allen Caswell (CEHD), Rich Klimoski (SOM), Margaret Weiss (CEHD), Phil Wiest (CHSS).

2014 Report to the Faculty Senate by the Faculty Athletic Representative

The Athletic Council met on October 23, 2013 and had three guest presentations:

- Debi Corbatta, Assistant Athletic Director for Sports Performance gave an overview on the additions and improvements to the Mason Athletic Training Facility and Sports Medicine Program.
- Dr. Debbie Wilson, Associate Athletic Director, Academic Services gave an overview of the services provided by her department for all student-athletes, and reported that more freshmen student-athletes were enrolled in Mason's Honors Program than ever before. Sixty-six per cent of student-athletes graduate in eight full time semesters. The A-10 Conference ranks 2nd in the nation for emphasis on academic performance. (NCAA's APR).
- Patricia Kelshaw, a member of the Student Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC) gave an overview of the council and its work. The SAAC is comprised of two members from each athletic team and meets regularly. There is a monthly conference call with the A-10. The five areas of the council's work are:
 1. Community Service (ex. Blood drive)
 2. Public Relations (Game of the Week)
 3. Social Committee (Picnic and formal dance)
 4. Academic and Career
 5. Diversity Committee

The February 12, 2014 meeting focused on updates from the A-10 calls with all conference Athletic Directors, Senior Woman Administrators, and Faculty Athletic Representatives. In addition, Paul Bowden, Associate Athletic Director, Compliance informed the council of the change in NCAA initial eligibility that goes into effect in the Fall of 2016. There will be increased requirements for 2 year college transfers and an increase in the cumulative grade point average.

On April 16, 2014, the council held its final meeting of the year and received updates and made recommendations for sub-committee work. Updates included:

- Intercollegiate Athletics, met with the Master Plan consultants to review current ICA facilities as well as future facility needs.
- The search committee for a new Athletic Director includes the Faculty Athletic Representative, student-athlete and student-government as well as broad representation across the campus. Tom O'Connor summarized the first year in the A-10 saying the new conference gave Mason increased visibility and outreach, particularly in the Northeast. Men's Soccer won the A-10 Championship and Bethany Sachtleben won Mason's first A10 Championship in Women's Cross Country.
- The following is a statement from Atlantic 10 Commissioner Bernadette V. McGlade on the unionization ruling:

"If this ruling is upheld it will certainly change our current mode of intercollegiate athletics and amateurism. I fully support doing everything we can to protect our student-athletes and provide for their short-term and long-term safety and well-being. However there are more effective ways to do this, some of which include changes in our current NCAA rules and regulations. As a National organization we need to address these changes more efficiently so that current student-athletes can benefit."

The April meeting concluded with unanimous acknowledgement of Tom O'Connor's long tenure as Athletic Director. The council voiced their appreciation of his leadership and support, and best wishes on his retirement as AD.

In conclusion, I would like to thank each Athletic Council member for their commitment and invaluable guidance and support. It has been an honor to serve.

Linda Miller
Faculty Athletic Representative
April 17, 2014

Cc: President Angel Cabrera
Chief of Staff Frank Neville
Assistant Vice President/Director of Athletics Tom O'Connor
Senior Associate Athletics Director Sue Collins

5. EFFECTIVE TEACHING – Lorraine Valdez Pierce (CEHD), Chair

Committee Members: John Cantiello (CHHS), Timothy Curby (CHSS), Danielle Rudes (CHSS), Rodger Smith (CHSS), Ghania Zgheib (ELI).

Report of the Committee on Effective Teaching (University Standing Committee) to the Faculty Senate of George Mason University 2013-14
April 15, 2014

Committee Members

Chair: **Lorraine Valdez Pierce** (College of Education & Human Development)

Senator: **John Cantiello** (Health Administration & Policy)

Tim Curby (Applied Developmental Psychology)

Danielle Rudes (Criminology, Law, & Society)

Rodger Smith (Communication)

Ghania E. Zgheib (English Language Institute, Center for International Student Access)

With three new members on the Committee this year, we stepped back and re-evaluated the Charge of the Committee, its previous work, and its goals for 2013-14. As a result of this process, we accomplished the following tasks:

1. We responded to the request by Star Muir of the Organization & Operations Committee on the need for the Charge of this Committee to be revised to improve its usefulness to faculty. In particular, we suggested aligning the Charge with overall goals of improving teaching and learning and promoting teaching innovation. We also suggested enabling this Committee to support the use of formative and self-assessment to promote professional growth and teaching effectiveness. In addition, we suggested establishing formal relationships with the Center for Teaching & Faculty Excellence (CTFE) and the Office of Institutional Research & Reporting (IRR) to promote collaboration in revising the Course Evaluation Form and improving teaching effectiveness.
2. We met with Kim Eby of the CTFE and Kris Smith of IRR to discuss plans to disseminate a faculty survey on the current Course Evaluation Form.
3. We drafted a faculty survey for feedback on the usefulness of the current Course Evaluation Form (last revised in 2006), gathered feedback on it from selected faculty members and students, revised it, and plan to disseminate it to all full-time, adjunct, and term faculty and instructors in April 2014.
4. In Summer 2014, we plan to analyze the results of the faculty survey.

Work to pursue in 2014 – 15:

- a. Meet with various focus groups (i.e., adjuncts, full-time faculty, Deans, students) to expand suggestions for improving the Course Evaluation Form. Recommend changes to the current Course Evaluation Form based on results of focus groups and Faculty Survey from April 2014.
- b. Follow-up on approval of modification of Charge to this Committee
- c. Proceed with establishing an online presence that provides a forum for faculty feedback on the usefulness of the current Course Evaluation Form. On this web site we could post a draft of our Faculty Guide for using results of Course Evaluations to improve teaching.

Two Committee members have decided not to remain on the Committee next year: **Tim Curby & Ghania E. Zgheib**. In addition, the term of Faculty Senator **John Cantiello** expires in 2014, so we will be welcoming a new Senator on this committee in September 2014. Other Committee members are willing to remain assembled for the 2014-15 academic year to continue and complete this work.

6. EXTERNAL ACADEMIC RELATIONS – Alok Berry (VSE) and David Kuebrich (CHSS), Co-chairs. Committee Members: Changwoo Ahn (COS), Mike Dickerson (CHSS), John Riskind (CHSS), Pierre Rodgers (CEHD), Lesley Smith (CHSS).

The Committee met in Fall, 2013 to plan its work. In the late Fall it met, separately, with Delegates David Bulova and Tom Rust to discuss the bills the FSVA and the VA Conference of the AAUP wanted to propose in the upcoming legislative session. Bulova agreed to sponsor one of these: a bill that would place two faculty members on the Commission for Higher Education Board Appointments. It was approved by the Legislature and signed by the Governor. The Committee also had email exchanges with several other Northern Virginia legislators. The Committee plans to meet once more this semester to plan its summer and early fall activities.

Changwoo Ahn, Alok Berry (co-chair), Michael Dickerson, David Kuebrich (co-chair), John Riskind, Pierre Rodgers, Lesley Smith

**7. FACULTY HANDBOOK – Suzanne Slayden (COS), Chair
Committee Members: Kevin Curtin (COS), Elavie Ndura (CEHD).**

The Committee met 8 times during the 2013-2014 academic year. Administrators Renate Guilford, Associate Provost and Michelle Lim, Human Resources, also met with the committee. Proposals for changes to the Faculty Handbook were considered. Among the proposed revisions were those requested by the BOV to amend certain language in the Preface and Chapter 1.

The changes were submitted to the Faculty Senate over several meetings during the year. The approved revisions, which were also approved by the relevant administrators and reviewed by the University Counsel's office, have been submitted to the BOV for consideration at its May 7th meeting.

Revisions that have been referred back to Committee are those pertaining to Section 1.2. that were discussed during the Faculty Senate meeting on April 2, 2014.

**8. GRIEVANCE – Paul Houser (CHSS), Chair
Committee Members: Rick Coffinberger (SOM), Doris Bitler Davis (CHSS), Mike O'Malley (CHSS), Joe Scimecca (CHSS).**

9. MASON CORE – Janette Muir (CHSS), Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, Chair. Committee Members: Dominique Banville (CEHD), Melissa Broekelman-Post (CHSS), Rick Diecchio (COS), Kelly Dunne (CHSS), Kim Eby (Associate Provost for Faculty Development), Rebecca Ericson (COS), Doug Eyman (CHSS), Mack Holt (CHSS), Tamara Maddox (VSE – Spring 14), Roger Paden (CHSS – Fall 13), Frank Allen Philpot (SOM), Mark Uhen (COS), Carol Urban (CHSS).

Mason Core Committee Members: Janette Muir (AP-UG, Chair). Dominique Banville (RHT-CEHD), Melissa Broeckelman-Post (CHSS), Rick Diecchio (COS), Kelly Dunne (NCC-CHSS), Rebecca Ericson (COS), Douglas Eyman (CHSS), Mack Holt (CHSS), Tamara Maddox (VSE), Frank Allen Philpot (SOM), Mark Uhen (COS), Carol Urban (CHHS), Peter Winant (CVPA), Peter Kleine (Student Representative). Ex officios: Kim Eby (Associate Provost/Center for Faculty and Teaching Excellence), Stephanie Hazel (Associate Director, Institutional Assessment). Mason Core Coordinator: Marcy Glover.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MASON CORE COMMITTEE

April 18, 2014

Programmatic Changes

The University General Education program officially changed its name to the Mason Core this year with the Faculty Senate's approval. At the same time, a proposal to allow students to double count approved courses within the Mason Core was also approved, not to exceed 6 credit hours.

The Mason Core was created to reframe the university general education program both to better illuminate the full range of coursework that prepares students for work in their major and to align with the Mason Graduate goals. In essence, the Mason Core is the foundational aspect of a student's academic career.

The Mason Core is comprised of elements important to all students pursuing a liberal arts education that map to the key characteristics of the Mason Graduate. The Core consists of two major areas: general education requirements and a writing intensive course in one's major. These courses are designed to complement work in a student's chosen area of study. Core classes serve as a means of discovery for students, providing a foundation for learning, connecting to potential new areas of interest and building tools for success in whatever field a student pursues. Learning outcomes are guided by the qualities every student should develop as they move toward graduating with a George Mason University bachelor's degree.

Currently the Core committee is working on a proposal to transition the synthesis requirement to a Capstone or culminating experience and will present this to the Faculty Senate again in Fall 2014.

Assessment

The Natural Science, Quantitative Reasoning and Oral Communication categories were assessed this year. The final analysis will be available this summer.

Category and Course Proposals

The committee considered **12** and approved **8** new courses for the Mason Core the others being sent back for revision or clarification or table due to current discussions on Synthesis to Capstone conversion.

In addition, we were asked to consider the following proposals:

- Require all students to take at least one UNIV course during their time at Mason. - denied
- Request from Bioengineering program to be exempted from one category of the Mason Core due to their heavy credit load. This was denied as students are essentially pursuing a double major and therefore are responsible for any additional coursework. However, the Faculty Senate approval of double-counting will alleviate this issue.

10. MINORITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES – Nirup Menon (SOM), Chair

Committee Members: Xiaomei Cai (CHSS), Jian Lu (COS), Kristy L. Park (CEHD), Suzanne Scott (CHSS).

Minority and Diversity Issues Committee’s Annual Report to the Faculty Senate 2014

The committee consisted of Nirup Menon, Xiaomei Cai, Jian Li, Kristy Park, Suzanne Scott, Gerardine Mobley. I served as the Chair.

We met four times face-to-face, in addition to email discussions in between the meeting dates.

The committee accomplished the following:

- Invited Ric Chollar to provide an overview of LGBTQ “issues.” The invitation arose from members’ sense that they did not have enough information to weigh in on the Senate resolution for benefits for same-sex couples at Mason.
- Suzanne Scott spoke at the Faculty Senate meeting to seek faculty input on potential concerns departments or programs may have.
- MDIC committee members contacted or tried to contact offices of ODS, CTFE, ODIME, etc., to see how it could fulfill its charge by engaging these offices.
- The MDIC invited Dr. Dennis Webster to speak to the committee. He was joined by Dr. Mark Hopson and Dr. Angela Hattery for the first part of the discussion. Dennis is the Director of Special Diversity Projects and the coordinator of Campus Climate Committee. He was responsible for Bias Incident Report Form (BIRF). He is currently working with Mark of the Communications Department and Angela, Director of the Women and Gender Studies Program, who are part of the Faculty Liaison Network. Angie and Mark spoke to the committee about the national cases of student intimidation and threats against teachers. They noted that nearly always, these cases involve minority females who are targeted by a network of students who tape classes and issue complaints about faculty.
- The committee plans to work with Dennis Webster and others on campus to increase awareness among faculty members on campus of the resources that they have available to them in case they have minority and diversity related concerns and issues.

Signed --- Nirup Menon ---Chair, MDIC

11. NON-TRADITIONAL, INTERDISCIPLINARY, AND ADULT LEARNING (NIAL) – Nada Dabbagh (CEHD), Chair. Committee Members: Kathryn Jacobsen (CHHS), Jeng-Eng Lin (COS), Kristin Scott (CHSS), Karen Studd (CVPA).

My understanding is that the committee has not met for several years and was likely to be dissolved – it is on the list of committees being considered for deletion or elimination, not because NIAL issues are not important but because with more than 20 Faculty Senate and university faculty standing committees there are considerable overlaps in mandates. The “O&O” (Organization and Operations) committee of Faculty Senate is looking for ways to streamline committee assignments, reduce redundancies, and ensure that all standing committees are able to contribute to the university in a meaningful way each year.

No issues have been raised in the Faculty Senate that were referred to this committee in the last several years. Having said this however, everything in the academic communities shows trends moving more and more to cross disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary, executive education, and professional development. Perhaps this committee ought to be reinvented under a different name “executive education committee” or something similar.

**12. SALARY EQUITY STUDY – Margret Hjalmarson (CEHD), Chair
Committee Members: Penelope Earley (CEHD), Eden King (CHSS), Rory Muhammad (Associate Director, Compliance, Diversity and Ethics), Lesley Smith (CHSS), Monique Van Hoek (COS), Catherine Wright (CHSS).**

**13. TECHNOLOGY POLICY – Stanley Zoltek (COS), Chair
Committee Members: Alok Berry (VSE), Gerald Hanweck (SOM), Goodlet McDaniel (CHHS), Dieter Pfoser (COS), Pallab Sanyal (SOM), Catherine Sausville (COS).**

2013-2014

Technology Policy - Stanley Zoltek (COS), Chair

Committee Members Alok Berry (VSE), Gerald Hanweck (SOM), Goodlet McDaniel (CHHS), Dieter Pfoser (COS), Pallab Sanyal (SOM), Catherine Sausville (COS)

The Faculty Senate Technology Policy Committee has met five times during the 2013-2014 academic year. The committee’s last meeting of the academic year will be on May 6. As always, the committee encourages faculty to submit agenda items for the committee’s consideration.

The work of the committee would not have been possible without the close cooperation of Sharon Pitt, Interim Deputy CIO and the University’s new CIO Marilyn Smith and their senior staff.

Briefings and recommendations:

- Office 365 email
 - Microsoft schedules when upgrade and maintenance downtimes will occur
 - ITU reports known email issues to Microsoft

- Some issues can only be resolved by Microsoft upgrading or patching its email product
- It is important that faculty/staff contact the Support Desk about email problems so that these issues are reported to Microsoft
- The committee suggests that Mason either form or join a consortium/support group of other universities using Office 365
 - Mason's email group frequently communicates with other universities using Office 365
- Committee briefed on the "Privacy Policy for Employees' Electronic Communications"
 - Faculty were included in the group that developed the policy
- Committee reported that faculty have expressed concerns about limitations on what software they can use for instruction because of various privacy regulations involving student information, etc.
 - ITU is forming a list of products that meet privacy requirements and encourages faculty to recommend products they have used or wish to use
- Faculty want to print while connected to the University's wireless network
 - ITU is examining several ways to allow such printing
- Committee member reported that instructional videos in QuickTime format would not play in student labs on campus
 - Issue has been resolved and policy put in place to avoid such issues in the future
- Committee member noted that Mason's directions for configuring mobile devices to read student email were difficult to follow due to sequencing issues (this issue has been resolved)
- Committee was briefed on planned classroom technology updates/changes
- The committee expressed concern regarding the stability of Blackboard and urged ITU to be open to considering alternate products
 - The cost and impact of transitioning would have to be carefully studied before any changes could be considered

14. UNIVERSITY PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REVIEW APPEAL (UPTRAC) – Paula Petrik (CHSS), Chair. Committee Members: Marty DeNys (CHSS), Dimitrios Ioannou (VSE), Cody Edwards (Associate Provost for Graduate Education), Daniel Polsby, Dean, School of Law. Committee Alternates: Jan Arminio (CHSS), Jessica Scarlata (CHSS), James Olds (Director, Krasnow Institute for Advanced Study).

The committee's work depends on the department's, college's, and administration's for three-year renewal, promotion and tenure. We anticipate receiving two appeals before the end of the spring term, but the number could decrease or increase as the semester draws to a close.

**15. WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM - Stanley Zoltek (COS), Chair
Committee Members: Jacquelyn Brown (SOM), Benedict Carton (CHSS), Charlene Douglas (CHSS), Michelle LaFrance (WAC Program Director, *ex-officio*), Tamara Maddox (VSE),**

Gregory Robinson (CVPA), Arthur Romano (S-CAR), Solon Simmons (S-CAR), Sharon Williams van Roojj (CEHD).

2013-2014

Writing Across the Curriculum Committee Report

Chair: Stanley Zoltek (COS)

Committee Members: Jackie Brown (SOM), Benedict Carson (CHSS), Charlene Douglas (CHHS), Tamara Maddox (VSE), Tom Owens (CVPA, 2013), Greg Robinson (CVPA, 2014), Solon Simmons (S-CAR), Sharhron Williams Van Roojj (CEHD), Stanley Zoltek (COS)

Consultants to the Committee: Melissa Allen (English Language Institute), Peggy Brouse (Systems Engineering), Peter Farrell (Volgenau School of Engineering), Dot Lockabee (University Libraries, 2013) Karyn Mallett (English Language Institute), Shelley Reid (Composition), Larry Rockwood (Biology), Ellen Rodgers (CEHD), Paul Rogers (English, Northern Virginia Writing Project), Jen Stevens (University Libraries, 2014), Bethany Usher (Center for Teaching Excellence, OSCAR)

WAC Program:

Director: Michelle LaFrance

Assistant Director: Sarah Baker

WAC Program Research Assistant: Ryan Sheehan

The committee has met 4 times (to date) during the 2013-2014 academic year (two more meetings are scheduled for April 21st, 2014, and May 12, 2014). The committee's charge includes: advising the director of Writing Across the Curriculum, approval of new writing-intensive (WI) courses, regular review of WI course syllabi, and assisting with activities and events related to Writing Across the Curriculum.

WAC now reports to the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education.

2013-2014 Committee Actions:

- Approved two new WI Courses: PHED 340 (2013) and CYSE 490 (2014)
- Discussed enrollments in WI courses to assess compliance with 35-seat requirements and addressed non-compliant courses/departments.
- Participated in the RE/View Campus Profile initiative to collect information about WI Courses and WAC Program needs on campus.
- Reviewed data collected about WI courses by the new director of WAC, including: drop/fail/withdrawal rates for WI courses, RE/View Profile data, and other information related to WI course and writing instruction on campus.

WAC Program Director Activities (Discussed w/ WAC Committee Members):

- Researched the approval dates for all WI courses that are currently offered.
- Performed a WI course audit to determine the complete/current list of WI courses campus-wide. These courses will be identified in the 2015-2016 course catalogue. The registrar will create a consistent attribute in Banner for easier communication campus-wide about WI-course requirements.
- Tracked the drop/fail/withdrawal rates for WI courses.

- In partnership with SOM 301 faculty, reinstated the Writing Fellows Program.
- Prepared the WAC newsletter for release early May of 2014.
- Began a blog, *The Writing Campus*, which will be officially launched in early May of 2014.
- Increased the WAC program social media presence by creating/maintaining a Facebook page and Twitter feed.

Other:

- For the 12th year in a row, Mason’s WAC program made the *U.S. News* “Best Colleges 2013” list of highly ranked colleges for Writing in the Disciplines (WID).
- At the time of this report, a search for a full-time, 12-mo Assistant Director of the WAC program is ongoing.

Report compiled by Ryan Sheehan

ATTACHMENT F

ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEES 2013-2014

1. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON TEXTBOOK AFFORDABILITY

Doris Bitler Davis (CHSS), Chair; Keith Renshaw (CHSS)

Ad hoc committee on textbook affordability – Annual report 2013-2014

The ad hoc committee on textbook affordability reviewed the minutes of the University Task Force on Textbook Affordability, read a number of articles on the topic of textbook affordability, and perused the relevant sections of the Higher Education Opportunity Act. Based on our assessment of these materials, we sent the following recommendations to the University Task Force on Textbook Affordability:

- Informational emails should be sent to faculty and students highlighting the University’s commitment to textbook affordability and providing relevant information about the issue
- Surveys of faculty and students should be developed to assess current strategies related to textbook affordability and soliciting ideas
- Each academic department should assign a faculty member to serve as a textbook affordability liaison to facilitate sharing information
- A team should be formed to attend departmental meetings to share information and discuss textbook affordability strategies (perhaps including the faculty liaison for the department)
- Department staff responsible for gathering textbook orders should a) include information on affordability and related resources b) connect instructors of different sections of the same course to facilitate adoption of the same text across sections c) provide information about textbooks that have been used in recent semesters
- Representatives of major publishers should be contacted and invited to participate in Mason’s initiative to make textbooks more affordable
- The University bookstore should be encouraged to work more closely and directly with faculty

2. FACULTY SENATE TASK FORCE TO EXAMINE AGREEMENTS BETWEEN GMU AND PRIVATE DONORS - Dave Kuebrich (CHSS – Chair)

Committee Members: Penny Earley (CEHD), Esther Elstun (CHSS – *Emerita*), Rich Rubenstein (S-CAR) The Task Force did not meet. Research on various relevant issues continues. The Task Force plans to make a full report in Fall, 2014.

Penelope Earley, Esther Elstun , Dave Kuebrich (Chair), Richard Rubenstein

ATTACHMENT G

(see pp. 36-37)



College of Visual and Performing Arts
4400 University Drive, MS 4C1, Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Phone: 703-993-8877; Fax: 703-993-8883

Date: April 2, 2014

Memo To: Faculty Senate
Charlene Y. Douglas, President

From: William Reeder, Dean
College of Visual and Performing Arts

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "William Reeder". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

RE: Request for Senate approval of Emeritus status for Dr. Victoria Salmon

After many years of service, Dr. Victoria Salmon is retiring from George Mason University. We are requesting Senate approval to confer Emeritus status to Dr. Salmon.

Dr. Salmon has served as the founding Associate Dean of Graduate Studies for the College of Visual and Performing Arts. Prior to coming to the College, she was a leading administrator in the Higher Education program. Her employment over the years at Mason has been as Admin Faculty and she is not tenured, hence the need for Senate Approval. Provost Peter Stearns concurs with this request.

As Associate Dean, Dr. Salmon developed the College's first PhD and DMA degree offerings in Music, a Master of Arts in Teaching and MA in Graphic Design in the School of Art, and a newly authorized MA in Computer Game Design.

She is currently designing MFA offerings in Theater, Arts Management, Film and Video Studies and in Computer Game Design, which should see completion before she formally retires. She has also developed MAIS offerings in Theater Education and in Film and Video Studies. And, she has been central to the growth and development of the Masters in Arts Management, and MFA programs in Dance and Art. Enrollment in graduate

programs in the College has grown from under 90 students when Dr. Salmon started to almost 260 students today. Financial support for graduate students has risen from less than \$40,000 annually to over \$250,000.

The importance and value of these efforts to the College cannot be overstated. In addition to her Associate Dean's role, Dr. Salmon has maintained a robust teaching schedule and has provided leadership for CVPA's international programs and activities. She has served on a large number of dissertation committees in both CVPA and the Higher Ed program. Finally, she has been an active fundraiser for the School, and has introduced some of the College's most generous donors to our work.

We heartily request Senate approval for this request of Emeritus Status for Dr. Salmon and would gladly speak further on her behalf. With Senate approval, Provost Stearns has indicated willingness to support this request with the BOV.

Respectfully Submitted,
William Reeder