# GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
# AGENDA FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
# MARCH 7, 2018
# Robinson Hall B113, 3:00 – 4:15 p.m.

**I.**    **Call to Order**

**II.**    **Approval of the Minutes of February 7, 2018**

**III.**    **Announcements**
President Cabrera
Additional Faculty Senate Meeting: March 28 3:00 – 4:15

**IV.**    **Committee Reports**
    **A.  Senate Standing Committees**
      *Executive Committee*
      *Academic Policies*
        Summer Calendar 2018             Attachment A
      *Budget and Resources*
      *Faculty Matters*
      *Nominations*
        Jim Metcalf (CHHS) is nominated for Grievance Committee
        Amarda Shehu (VSE) is nominated for Research Advisory Committee
      *Organization and Operations*
        Apportionment of Senate Seats 2018-19        Attachment B

    **B.  Other Committees/Faculty Representatives**
      Mason Core Committee (Melissa Broeckelman-Post)
        Proposed Changes to IT/Ethics - 2<sup>nd</sup> view and vote     Attachment C
      Faculty Handbook Committee (Suzanne Slayden)
         Proposed revisions (1<sup>st</sup> view)            Attachment D
      Effective Teaching Committee (Lorraine Valdez Pierce)
         Proposed Pilot of Changes to Student Ratings of Instruction Form    Attachment E
         Background Information and References        Link to Document

**V.**    **New Business**
    CEHD Proposed Pilot: New Student Rating of Instruction Form
    (Dominique Banville)            Attachment F

**VI.**    **Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty**

**VI.**    **Adjournment**

**Academic Policies Committee**                              Mar. 7, 2018

The 2018 Summer Term Calendar as submitted by the Registrar and reviewed by the Committee appears on the next page.

This year, the Add and Drop deadlines, and the Selective Withdrawal periods have been adjusted to be proportional to those of the 15-week semesters.

Because of the many meeting time blocks in each summer session (1, A, B, C, D) and the difficulty in administering three unique deadlines for each, the deadlines for each session correspond to the latest deadline date for all the time blocks in the session.

> The Academic Policies Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the 2018 Summer Term Calendar with the understanding that the individual summer session calendars will still be submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Registrar the preceding fall.

# Summer 2018 Calendar (updated 2-28-2018)

|  | Session 1 12 weeks | Session A 5 weeks | Session B 8 weeks | Session C 5 weeks | Session D 10 weeks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| First day of classes | Mon May 21 | Mon May 21 | Mon Jun 4 | Mon Jun 25 | Mon May 21 |
| Last Day to Add (No tuition liability) (census) | Tues May 29 | Wed May 23 | Thurs Jun 7 | Wed Jun 27 | Fri May 25 |
| Memorial Day (University closed) | Mon May 28 | | | | |
| Last Day to Drop | Tues Jun 19 | Mon Jun 4 | Thurs Jun 21 | Mon Jul 9 | Thurs Jun 14 |
| Selective Withdrawal Period (undergraduate) | Jun 20-Jul 12 | Jun 5 – Jun 12 | Jun 22 – Jul 9 | Jul 10- Jul 18 | Jun 15 – Jul 5 |
| Summer Recess (Classes do not meet) | Tue Jul 3 | | | | |
| Independence Day (University closed) | Wed Jul 4 | | | | |
| Dissertation/Thesis Deadline | Fri Aug 3 | | | | |
| Last Day of Class | Wed Aug 8 | Wed Jun 20 | Wed Jul 25 | Thurs Jul 26 | Wed Jul 25 |
| Final Exams | Aug 9-10 | Jun 21-23 | Jul 26-27 | Jul 27-28 | Jul 26-27 |
| Degree Conferral | Sat Aug 25 | | | | |

**Attachment B**

| Faculty Senate Allotments | 2017 FTE Full Time Faculty | 2017 FTE Part Time Faculty | 2017 FTE TOTAL | % of total Instructional Faculty | x 50 Seats | x 50 seats (weighted) | Previous Allocation 2017-2018 | Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Antonin Scalia Law School | 43 | 13.5 | 56.5 | 3% | 1.70 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| **College of Education and Human Development** | 119 | 66.7 | 185.7 | 11% | 5.59 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| College of Health and Human Services | 89 | 47.1 | 136.1 | 8% | 4.10 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| College of Humanities and Social Sciences | 349 | 98 | 447 | 27% | 13.46 | 13 | 14 | -1 |
| College of Science | 209 | 26 | 235 | 14% | 7.08 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| College of Visual and Performing Arts | 75 | 41.9 | 116.9 | 7% | 3.52 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution | 18 | 7.2 | 25.2 | 2% | 0.76 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| School of Business | 104 | 27 | 131 | 8% | 3.95 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| **Schar School of Policy and Government** | 67 | 18.6 | 85.6 | 5% | 2.58 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Volgenau School of Engineering | 186 | 55 | 241 | 15% | 7.26 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| | | | **1660** | 100% | 50 | 50 | 51 | 0 |

**CVPA 3.52% rounded DOWN to 3 to avoid rounding error that would create 51 seats.**

**Proposed IT Outcomes**
Approved by Mason Core Committee on 1/29/2018

Information technology and computing can significantly augment humans' ability to produce, consume, process, and communicate information. Thus, students need to understand ways to use such technology to enhance their lives, careers, and society, while being mindful of challenges such as security, source reliability, automation, and ethical implications. These factors have made it essential for students to understand how to effectively navigate the evolving technological landscape. IT courses offered in the majors may focus on disciplinary applications and concerns of information technology.

IT courses meet the following learning outcomes:
- Students will understand the principles of information storage, exchange, security, and privacy and be aware of related ethical issues.
- Students will become critical consumers of digital information; they will be capable of selecting and evaluating appropriate, relevant, and trustworthy sources of information.
- Students can use appropriate information technologies to organize and analyze information and use it to guide decision-making.
- Students will be able to choose and apply appropriate algorithmic methods to solve a problem.

---

*For reference: Current IT/Ethics Outcomes, which will be deleted*

**Learning Outcomes:**

Almost no area of academic, professional, or personal life is untouched by the information technology revolution. Success in college and beyond requires computer and information literacies that are flexible enough to change with a changing IT environment and adaptable to new problems and tasks.

The purpose of the information technology requirement is to ensure that students achieve an essential understanding of information technology infrastructure encompassing systems and devices; learn to make the most of the Web and other network resources; protect their digital data and devices; take advantage of latest technologies; and become more sophisticated technology users and consumers.

Courses meeting the "IT only" requirement must address learning outcomes 1 and 2, and one additional outcome. Courses meeting "IT with Ethics component" must address outcomes 1, 2, 3, and 5. Courses meeting the only IT Ethics component must address outcomes 3 and 5.

1. Students will be able to use technology to locate, access, evaluate, and use information, and appropriately cite resources from digital/electronic media.
2. Students will understand the core IT concepts in a range of current and emerging technologies and learn to apply appropriate technologies to a range of tasks.
3. Students will understand many of the key ethical, legal and social issues related to information technology and how to interpret and comply with ethical principles, laws, regulations, and institutional policies.
4. Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate, create, and collaborate effectively using state-of-the-art information technologies in multiple modalities.
5. Students will understand the essential issues related to information security, how to take precautions and use techniques and tools to defend against computer crimes.

**Required:** One approved 3-credit course that meets all IT requirements, or completion of an appropriate combination of courses.

**Faculty Handbook Revision Committee**
Mar. 7, 2018

**Proposed Revisions to the Faculty Handbook**

The proposed revisions to Sections 2.1.2, 2.7.3, and new 2.7.4 of the Faculty Handbook have been approved by the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee and the Provost. The changes can be viewed here: http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/FacultyHandbook/fac-hndbk-rev-2018.htm.

At this meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Committee will present the revisions and ask for brief discussion. Afterwards, the Committee will amend the revisions if necessary. At either the Mar. 28 or Apr. 4, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting, the Committee will ask that the proposed revisions be voted on without further change. If they are approved by the Faculty Senate, they will be submitted to the Board of Visitors for final approval.

The Committee welcomes comments and suggestions before and after the Faculty Senate meeting.

Committee members:                          Provost's Representative: Renate Guilford

Alan Abramson (SSPG)                        Human Resources: Michelle Lim

Cynthia Lum (CHSS)

Suzanne Slayden, Chair (COS)

**Motion to Faculty Senate – Course Evaluation Form**

The **Effective Teaching Committee** is charged with developing and helping implement procedures that encourage and reward effective teaching, enabling faculty to improve their teaching effectiveness independent of any evaluation procedures, and implementing procedures for evaluation of effective teaching.

The Committee is charged with recommending policy to the Faculty Senate and monitoring the use of such policy for the evaluation of teachers and courses, including the following:

A. Review, improve, and provide guidance to 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.

**Developing a New Course Evaluation Form – 2014 – 2018**

The primary task which the Committee has undertaken since 2014 is making recommendations for revising the Course Evaluation Form.  This form last underwent significant revision in 2008.  The Committee decided to undertake a rigorous development and review process based on measurement principles and those used for personnel evaluation.

To validate a new form, input has been obtained from a variety of sources, including a review of research on student evaluations of faculty teaching, two online surveys of all faculty at Mason (2014-16), a survey of a stratified random sample of Mason students (2017), a survey of all university Deans & Directors (2016), and a survey of Faculty Evaluation Teams across the university (2016).  In addition, we have reviewed the criteria for excellence in teaching proposed by both the Provost's Office and the Center for Teaching & Faculty Excellence, and we have collaborated with the Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness, the Provost's Office, the Center for Teaching & Faculty Excellence, and the Faculty Senate.

An analysis of the literature and survey data revealed several distinct categories of importance with regard to effective teaching.  The six categories consistently identified with effective teaching across all stakeholders were:

- Communication with students
- Student engagement
- Learning outcomes
- Preparation & organization
- Respect for students
- Passion for/Commitment to teaching

Based on these identified categories of effective teaching, we scoured the literature for sample items that reflected each category.  We added items for online courses.  The <u>resulting 21 items</u> are now being proposed, with an additional six items on student demographics, and several optional items on uses of technology.  Our intention is <u>to reduce the total number of items</u> for the final form after piloting the identified items.

Further, to identify the usefulness and clarity of each item under consideration for the new form, <u>Focus Groups and additional online surveys were conducted with several faculty and student groups during Feb. 2018</u> to gather additional input from stakeholders before finalizing and piloting the new form (see draft Course Evaluation Form on the next page).

The next task of the Committee will be to pilot the proposed items with online courses in May 2018 and with face-to-face courses in December 2018.

<u>Thus, the Committee moves</u>:

That the *Faculty Senate* recommend that the *Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE)* conduct a pilot evaluation of the draft student ratings of instruction form, as shown on the next page, this Spring 2018 with online courses.

All faculty teaching online courses in Spring 2018 are eligible to participate in the pilot testing of the new form, with the conditions that they must have approval from their program chair and have taught the course being evaluated online at least once in past 12 months.  Tenure-track, term, and adjunct faculty willing to participate would need assurance from program chairs or evaluation teams that pilot results would not be used for making employment decisions.

In December 2018, a second pilot test of the form with face-to-face courses should be made, after having made revisions based on the May 2018 administration.

Respectfully submitted by Members of the Effective Teaching Committee
On March 7, 2018

Mihai Boicu, *Volgenau Schl. of Engineering*
Esperanza Roman-Mendoza, *College of Humanities & Social Sciences (CHSS), Faculty Senator*
Tom Wood, *Schl. of Integrative Studies, CHSS*
Alexandria Zylstra, *Schl. of Business*
Lorraine V. Pierce, Chair, *Graduate Schl. of Education, CEHD*

# George Mason University
## *Course Evaluation Form*

### *Draft for May 2018 Pilot*

Course Title (e.g., HIST 101 001)_____Instructor's Name_____

## Student Information

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) What is your class level? | ○ Fresh. | ○ Soph. | ○ Junior  ○ Senior | | ○ Mast. | ○ Doct.  ○ Other |
| 2) For your plan of study, this course is: | | ○ a required course | ○ elective course | | ○ Mason Core/ general education course | ○ Other |
| 3) What is the class format/delivery? | ○ Face-to-face | ○ Hybrid | ○ Online | | | |
| 4) How many times were you absent from class sessions? | ○ 0-1 | ○ 2-3 | ○ 4-5 | ○ 6-7 | ○ 8 or more | ○ N/A |
| 5) On average, how many hours per week outside of class did you spend preparing for this class? | ○ 1-3 | ○ 4-6 | ○ 7-9 | ○ 10 or more hours | | |
| 6) What grade do you expect in this course? | ○ A  ○ B | ○ C | ○ D  ○ F | ○ Pass | ○ Fail | ○ Other |

**Please thoughtfully consider the following statements and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement.**

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A or Unknown |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Student Engagement** | | | | | | |
| 7) I completed all assigned tasks before each class. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 8) I consistently contributed to class activities/discussions. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 9) Instructional technologies, resources/tools used in this course increased my engagement with course content. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 10) The instructor created a learning environment that effectively encouraged my engagement with course content. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 11) The instructor encouraged expression of diverse perspectives. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| **Learning Outcomes** | | | | | | |
| 12) I gained an understanding of the main concepts in this course. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 13) I learned to think critically about issues in this area. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 14) The course provided a variety of learning opportunities (e.g. exams, assignments, projects, papers, discussions, group work, peer review). | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 15) The instructor's feedback helped me learn. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 16) The instructor's teaching methods/style encouraged my learning. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| **Instructor Engagement** | | | | | | |
| 17) The instructor treated students with respect. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 18) The instructor's commitment to the course subject matter had a positive effect on my learning. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 19) The instructor offered opportunities for students to provide feedback on the course. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 20) The instructor offered opportunities to meet outside of class time, such as virtual or in-person office hours. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |

## Instructor Preparation and Course Organization

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21) The course materials were well organized. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 22) The instructor clearly communicated the course expectations to students. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 23) The instructor clearly delivered/presented the course content. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |

## Optional questions on use of technology (can be added as supplemental questions 1-3 below)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24) Navigation throughout the online components of the course was appropriate for the complexity of the course. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 25) The course directed students to technology resources to help them succeed in an online learning environment. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |

## Additional questions added by the program or course instructor

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 2) | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 3) | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |

## Please respond to the following questions

1) Were there any significant obstacles to learning that were **beyond the control of the instructor** (e.g., scheduling or technology problems, university closings, limitations caused by other students or by group dynamics)? If so, please explain.

2) What 2 – 3 aspects of this course were most valuable to your learning experience?

- 

- 

- 

3) What 2 – 3 aspects of this course were least valuable to your learning experience?

- 

- 

- 

4) What modifications do you suggest for the next time the course is taught?

## Optional open-ended question on use of technology

5)  To what extent did the technology used in this course (e.g., Blackboard, synchronous learning, discussion board, Wikis) facilitate your learning?

*Thank you for your feedback!*

# Proposed Piloting of a New Student Evaluation of Teaching Form

*(This form was developed by a CEHD Task Force)*

## BACKGROUND

1.  During 2016-17 an ad hoc CEHD Task Force developed and "beta tested" a new student evaluation of teaching form in response to a recommendation from Mason's Effective Teaching Committee (2015 Annual Report):

> "To address faculty concerns with the current Course Evaluation form...,
> the Committee recommends the following actions: (1) Establish a
> university-wide competition for faculty and students to draft a new
> course evaluation form, pilot it, and validate it..."

2.  The Task Force had two primary objectives.  The first was to greatly increase the unacceptably low response rate that has been typical for online student evaluations.  Two methods were used to accomplish this objective:

> (a) dramatically shorten the length of the form (from 16 to 4 items); and
> (b) initiate the online administration process with a personal, motivationally compelling invitation from the College Dean focused on "helping your fellow Patriots."

3.  The second Task Force objective was to significantly increase the validity of the assessment (within the boundaries of what is possible from student perceptions) by eliminating all items describing *instructor behaviors* and focusing solely on *learning outcomes* caused by the instructor.  The tendency to measure instructor actions rather than instructor accomplishments reflects deeply ingrained behavioristic assumptions about linear causality.  Yet effective teaching is about *versatility,* not about enacting "correct" behaviors that will work for all students in all contexts.  There are many different pathways to the same learning outcome (*equifinality principle*).

In addition, an entirely new set of open-ended questions was developed.  These questions were worded using simple, concrete, action-oriented language focused on practical ways to improve (or maintain excellence in) teaching.

4.  Beta testing of the new student evaluation form with 8 classes indicated that students liked the new form and found it to be easy to fill out.  A majority of respondents preferred the new form ("[it] asks more questions I want to answer"; "Online surveys with a lot of questions are intimidating").  The beta testing also showed that all classes with high scores on the old form also had high scores on the new form, and all classes with low scores on the old form also had low scores on the new form.

# GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
## Office of Institutional Research and Reporting
### *Student Feedback Form*

Dear student,

Please help your fellow Patriots by providing us with feedback about your experiences in this class.  Your *confidential* responses will benefit future students while also contributing to our faculty's ongoing professional development.  Your feedback can also help us ensure that we have the right faculty teaching the right classes.

With gratitude,

Name of Dean (or Dean designee)

_____ _____

*Answers to the following questions are for your instructor's use only.  Your confidential responses will help ensure that Mason faculty (and future Mason students) benefit from your feedback.*

1. Were there any significant obstacles to learning that were beyond the control of the instructor (e.g., scheduling or technological problems, your investment of time and effort, limitations caused by other students or by group dynamics)?  If so, please explain:

2. Please comment on any or all of the following topics:

   a. What should the instructor CONTINUE doing?

   b. What should the instructor STOP doing?

   c. What should the instructor START doing?

3. And finally:  What would you like your instructor to know about your experience in this class?

*FAQs*

Why is this pilot only being conducted within just one academic unit (CEHD)?

For various technical reasons, IRR has stated that it is too late in the semester to do a pilot that is more ambitious than the one proposed in this motion.  The primary goal of the proposed pilot is to see if it is possible to significantly increase the response rate for online course evaluations, which is an achievable outcome within the population of Spring 2018 CEHD online classes.  If the outcome of this initial experiment is favorable, a broader pilot can be planned for Fall 2018.

What about CEHD faculty who are being reviewed for tenure, promotion, and contract renewal in 2018-19?

Because the pilot is restricted to CEHD (online) classes, the CEHD Dean's Office can ensure that no participating faculty member scheduled for such a review is negatively impacted by this experiment.  Faculty scheduled for such a review will also be given the chance to opt out of the pilot.  Many course evaluations for online classes are of no value in any case due to an inadequate response rate.

If the focus is on learning outcomes, why is there a question on motivation?  (Question 1: *The instructor positively influenced my motivation to learn the course content and skills.*)

Learning is a dynamic process that is both led and influenced by motivational processes (goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs).  Learning and motivation are thus inextricably linked.  In addition, motivation related to the course can persist long after learned content is forgotten, and serve as fuel for re-engaging with and elaborating on that content.  It is thus a desired outcome in its own right.

Question 2 seems familiar.  Isn't there a question very much like this on the current form?

Yes indeed – item 3 on the current form.  In a recent study conducted by IRR, this item, plus, to a lesser extent, one other item focused on motivation ("…the class was intellectually stimulating"), were the only two items that had substantial and unique predictive power with respect to the "overall teaching effectiveness" question.

Some of the questions seem to be trying to measure more than one thing at once.  Is that a problem?

No.  There is only one measurement target (construct) for each question.  This is only a problem if the words in the question lead the student to think about two different measurement targets simultaneously.  The strategy in the questions on the new form is to INCREASE the validity of the item by using multiple construct-relevant words that point to the SAME measurement target.

Question #3 essentially asks students to speculate about the future.  Is that wise?

At Mason, "genuine excellence" in teaching is associated with "impact beyond the boundaries of the classroom."  So, we need to ask students for their assessment of whether the instructor helped prepare them for **future learning experiences**, not just about the outcomes "within the boundaries of the classroom."

Question #4 sounds kind of like the "overall teaching effectiveness" question.  Doesn't that type of question have dubious validity?

Validity is a concern for questions that are generic and abstract, but this question is neither, as it specifically targets course learning outcomes ("…content, skills, and ways of thinking covered in this course.").

What about the extra questions that are typically added on at the end of the course evaluation form for online courses?

There are many occasions, and many methods through which an instructor can obtain feedback from students other than on the ONE occasion, through the ONE method that is used to obtain the feedback needed to make high-stakes

employment decisions and to satisfy external accreditors. Those extra questions (and many others) can be posed to students in other venues, at other times

What about the demographic questions that are usually included on a student evaluation form?

These questions are rarely ever used by faculty or by administrators.

One last question: How should the data from the four questions on this new form be aggregated?

The need to aggregate across items may be diminished given that there are only 4 items. But if a single summary number is preferred, it should be the mean of the 4 items, not the students' response to a single item. Reliability and validity are enhanced when multiple measures of the same fundamental construct are combined.

### MOTION

*The Faculty Senate recommends that the University pilot the new student evaluation form developed by the CEHD Task Force, as shown above, in full-semester CEHD courses that will use online student ratings of instruction during the Spring 2018 semester. This pilot should be structured as an experiment (thus making it possible to compare response rates for different forms) and conducted with the understanding that any faculty member scheduled for a promotion, tenure, or tenure-track contract renewal decision in the 2018-19 cycle should be excluded from this pilot.*

### THE CEHD TASK FORCE

### Instructional faculty
*(includes several experts in measurement and quantitative/qualitative/mixed methods)*

Rick Brigham (full professor)
Anna Evmenova (tenured associate professor)
Nancy Holincheck (term assistant professor)
Peggy King-Sears (full professor)
Joe Maxwell (full professor, now Emeritus)
Jenice View (tenured associate professor)

### Administrative and professional faculty

Martin Ford (Senior Associate Dean)
Ellen Rodgers (Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs)
Marie Champagne (Coordinator of Student Services)
Michelle Gnoleba (Academic Advisor)

### Classified Staff

Mary Wilson (Compliance and Database Integrity Officer)