

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY**  
**AGENDA FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**APRIL 25, 2018**  
**Robinson Hall B113, 3:00-4:15 p.m.**

**I. Call to Order**

**II. Approval of the Minutes of March 28 and April 4, 2018**

**III. Announcements**

- Rector Davis
- Provost Wu

**IV. Special Orders**

- Election of Faculty Senate Chair 2018-19

**V. Committee Reports**

**A. Senate Standing Committees**

Executive Committee

*Advancement/GMU Foundation Q&A*

Academic Policies

Budget and Resources

Faculty Matters

Nominations

Organization and Operations

*Faculty Support Liaisons*

[Link to attachment](#)

[Link to annual report](#)

[Link to annual report](#)

[Link to annual report](#)

[Link to annual report](#)

[Link to annual report](#)

[Attachment A](#)

**B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives**

Faculty Athletic Representative

[Attachment B](#)

Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee

*Charge*

[Attachment C](#)

*Motions regarding gift acceptance*

[Attachment D](#)

*Motion regarding extension of committee*

[Attachment E](#)

Annual Faculty Senate Evaluation of President/Provost

[Attachment F](#)

Annual Reports

Academic Appeals

[Link to annual report](#)

Academic Initiatives

[Link to annual report](#)

Admissions

[Link to annual report](#)

Adult Learning & Executive Education

[Link to annual report](#)

Athletic Council

[Link to annual report](#)

Effective Teaching

[Link to annual report](#)

External Academic Relations

[Link to annual report](#)

Faculty Handbook

[Link to annual report](#)

Grievance

[Link to annual report](#)

Mason Core

[Link to annual report](#)

Minority & Diversity Issues

[Link to annual report](#)

Multilingual Academic Support Committee

[Link to annual report](#)

Research Advisory Committee

[Link to annual report](#)

Salary Equity Study

[Link to annual report](#)

Technology Policy	<a href="#">Link to annual report</a>
University Promotion, Tenure, and Renewal Appeal	<a href="#">Link to annual report</a>
Writing Across the Curriculum	<a href="#">Link to annual report</a>
Ad Hoc Institutional COI	<a href="#">Link to annual report</a>
Undergraduate Council	<a href="#">Link to annual report</a>

**VI. New Business**

- Salary Information Context and Update (JJ Davis, Senior VP; Linda Harber, VP of Human Resources and Payroll)
- Athletics at Mason (Brad Edwards, Director of Intercollegiate Athletics)

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

**VIII. Adjournment**

## **ATTACHMENT A**

**DRAFT**

### **Faculty Support Liaison Pilot Program**

#### **Background**

Each Academic Year, individual faculty may be involved in investigations primarily initiated by Compliance, Diversity and Ethics (CDE), University Audit, and Research Integrity. These faculty may be the subject of a complaint made by another member of the community, may be involved as witnesses, or may initiate a complaint.

During these formal and informal investigations, as well as other situations where faculty attempt to resolve work-related problems, faculty members typically are in need of support. Common questions that come up during these proceedings include: the process, timeframe, and potential consequences/outcomes. Employee Relations and Organizational Development (HR/Payroll) (ER) has historically supported faculty who seek advice, guidance, information, and support during these investigatory processes and will continue to do so. ER can sometimes handle the demand; though not when there is a conflict between the support role and the administrative responsibilities held by ER. Faculty sometimes informally seek out other faculty for the same purpose - information gathering, advice, support. However, these faculty may not be equipped with the level of knowledge needed to provide adequate support or information.

#### **Proposal**

We propose to identify, train and advertise specific faculty members as Faculty Support Liaisons (FSL). Employee Relations and Organizational Development (HR/Payroll) ER will lead the effort and training with collaboration and support of the Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs), the Provost's Office, and other university areas/resources as needed.

#### **Appointment**

Liaisons will represent a variety of academic units and should be a diverse representation of the faculty. One and two academic year (renewable) appointments are recommended. Overlap of individuals serving in the roles will be critical to promote cross-training and provide continuity of knowledge management and service.

In recognition of the importance of the work and the time commitment, a \$2,000 yearly stipend or a course release will be offered to faculty who undertake these roles.

#### **Eligibility**

Tenured faculty ( for the purposes of this pilot program) are eligible to serve in the Faculty Support Liaison role. Faculty will submit relevant materials to be considered for the role. Materials will be evaluated based on a number of factors, such as experience in and familiarity with various regulations, policies, procedures and other aspects of the University.

## **DRAFT**

### Faculty Support Liaison Pilot Program

#### **Guiding Principles/Charges of the Faculty Support Liaisons**

Faculty Support Liaisons would be a neutral, informal, and confidential resource group. A set of guidelines and training procedures will be created to help guide the Faculty Support Liaisons.

An annual roster of Faculty Support Liaisons will be provided to all faculty members who are involved in all inquiries, or investigations initiated by Compliance, Diversity and Ethics (CDE), University Audit, Research Integrity, or through Faculty Handbook procedures. The faculty members may choose to contact an FSL with whom he or she would be able to discuss their issues and concerns.

##### ***Neutrality***

The Faculty Support Liaison will aim for achieving fair outcomes and encourage people to act decently and fairly.

##### ***Informality***

The Faculty Support Liaison will be an informal resource and will not arbitrate, adjudicate, testify, or participate in any formal process. If an individual wishes to report a problem or make a complaint, the Faculty Support Liaison will direct the individual to the appropriate person, office, or procedure.

##### ***Confidentiality***

The Faculty Support Liaison will not identify the individual or his/her confidences without permission, except in situations involving imminent risk of physical harm, child abuse, or other issues requiring mandatory reporting. Each liaison will be required to sign a confidentiality agreement.

##### ***Disclosure Agreements***

In recognition of every faculty member's responsibility as a mandatory reporter per Title IX, Faculty Support Liaisons will sign an agreement to clarify how this defines their role. Also, similar responsibilities relate to hearing allegations of fraud which require mandatory reporting.

##### ***What a Faculty Support Liaison will do***

Provide a neutral, informal, and confidential person for a faculty member to discuss the current issue or situation;

Refer faculty to other offices or departments that may be able to provide support or resources to assist in seeking resolution or conclusion to the matter;

## **DRAFT**

### **Faculty Support Liaison Pilot Program**

Attend meetings or interviews that are a part of the investigatory processes of CDE, University Audit, or Research Integrity as a support person;

Help faculty navigate the various processes that are a part of any investigation related to a complaint in which they may be involved, and provide support or coaching to them throughout the process.

#### ***What a Faculty Support Liaison will not do:***

Provide advice on a particular course of action with regard to an investigation.

Advocate for faculty during their involvement in interviews, meetings, or other discussions related to the complaints or issues being investigated,

Implement or execute actions that may be determined as part of the resolution of an issue.

#### **Budget**

For internal and external training resources, annual budget cost would be around \$7,500 to \$10,000.

Additional budget will be required to provide stipends and course release (amount TBD).

#### **Plan**

Training of group: August 2018

Implementation: Fall 2018

#### **Monitor and Evaluate Plan**

Parameters for evaluation will be determined in the Spring of 2019.

The Program will be evaluated annually beginning in the Fall of 2019 by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Support Liaison Team.

## ATTACHMENT B



George Mason University has over 500 student-athletes engaged in over 20 different sports, representing us in intercollegiate competitions while pursuing their college degrees. Per NCAA requirement, the university President appoints a Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) to represent the institution and its faculty in the relationship between the NCAA and the local campus. While each institution determines the role of their FAR, the Faculty Athletic Representative Association (FARA) identifies three areas of involvement: Student-Athletes well-being, Academic Integrity, and Institutional Control. The FAR has therefore a unique role of representing both academic and athletic interests.

At Mason, the FAR:

- Serves as a liaison between the institution and the athletics department, and also as a representative in A-10 conference and NCAA affairs;
- Ensures that Mason establishes and maintains the appropriate balance between academics and intercollegiate athletics;
- Promotes understanding of sports and their relationship to the educational and ethical commitment of George Mason University;
- Serves as Chair of the University's Athletic Council, and provides oversight and general administration to the sub-committees within the Athletic Council, including being actively involved in the assurance of the academic integrity of the Athletic program and in the maintenance of the welfare of the student-athlete.

*How to support Student-Athletes in their pursuit of excellence on and off the court/field/pool/track/course?*

- Faculty may receive inquiries about mid-semester progress for student-athletes. Sharing information about student-athletes with their athletic and academic advisors in this way is allowed under FERPA regulations; this feedback is taken seriously by advisors, and can be vital in supporting student success.
- One of the most frequent challenges faculty encounter in supporting student-athletes comes in providing accommodations for course work or examinations that students need to complete that is affected by their competition schedule. Students are encouraged to consult with faculty well in advance of these events, and faculty may consider options such as
  - ✓ asking students to complete course work ahead of time;
  - ✓ asking students to complete course work by a new deadline;
  - ✓ asking students to complete exams on the Mason campus, at a reasonable time before or after the athletic event, using the university testing center if needed;
  - ✓ asking students to complete course work or exams on the road, using a testing center at the institution they are visiting if needed.

Questions or concerns about how to support student-athletes can be directed to the Mason FAR:

Dominique Banville, Ph.D.

Director, Division of Health and Human Performance

Academic Program Coordinator, Health and Physical Education Licensure Program

College of Education and Human Development

Email: [dbanvill@gmu.edu](mailto:dbanvill@gmu.edu)

Phone: 703-993-3579

## **Attachment C**

### **Charge: Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee**

- The Faculty Senate and the Administration collaborate to develop a detailed policy for dealing with conflicts of interest arising from private donations, ownership in licensed intellectual property, and other relevant circumstances.
- The resulting policy include instructions for how its provisions are to be implemented.
- The resulting policy be consistent with AAUP guidelines (or, if not, the Committee's report should explain why one or more of these guidelines are inappropriate).
- The committee complete its work and provide a final report to the Senate no later than the Senate's final scheduled meeting of the Spring 2017 semester.

## ATTACHMENT D

### Motions from the Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee

#### Preface

According to the AAUP, “*an institutional [conflict of interest] COI occurs when the financial interests of an institution or institutional officials, acting within their authority on behalf of the institution, may affect or appear to affect the research, education, clinical care, business transactions, or other governing activities of the institution*” (*Recommended Principles to Guide Academy Industry Relationships* [Univ. of IL Press, 2014], p.12).

To protect against institutional COI, we believe the Faculty Senate, the University Administration and the George Mason University Foundation (GMUF) should collaborate in the creation of a new or revised gift acceptance policy (Policy #1123 -- <https://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/gift-acceptance-policy/>) that fully incorporates AAUP principles of faculty governance, academic freedom, transparency, avoidance of real or perceived conflicts of interest, and service to the public good. The first two principles of the AAUP’s *Recommended Principles to Guide Academy Industry Relationships* (p. 4) state:

**PRINCIPLE 1**—Faculty Governance: The university must preserve the primacy of shared academic governance in establishing campuswide policies for planning, developing, implementing, monitoring, and assessing all donor agreements and collaborations, whether with private industry, government, or nonprofit groups. Faculty, not outside sponsors, should retain majority control over the campus management of such agreements and collaborations.

**PRINCIPLE 2**—Academic Freedom, Autonomy, and Control: The university must preserve its academic autonomy—including the academic freedom rights of faculty, students, postdoctoral fellows, and academic professionals—in all its relationships with industry and other funding sources by maintaining majority academic control over joint academy-industry committees and exclusive academic control over core academic functions (such as faculty research evaluations, faculty hiring and promotion decisions, classroom teaching, curriculum development, and course content).

In the spirit of these principles, we offer for consideration the following two motions, which we believe are also consistent with existing principles outlined in the Foundation’s Donor Bill of Rights.

#### **I. Motion Concerning Transparency**

The Gift Acceptance Policy shall be amended to ensure that all George Mason University Foundation gift, pledge, and grant agreements are published in a permanent online database for public review within 30 days of formal enactment. For gifts, pledges, and grants for which the



donor or grantor has requested anonymity and the Gift Acceptance Committee has determined no real or perceived conflict of interest with regard to values of faculty governance and academic freedom and autonomy exists, donor-identifying information may be redacted.

We call on the Administration and George Mason University Foundation to respond to this request and report back to the Faculty Senate at the September 2018 Faculty Senate Meeting.

---

## **II. Motion Concerning Faculty Governance**

To allow for shared governance and adequate faculty input, two tenured faculty will be elected by the Faculty Senate to serve on the Gift Acceptance Committee (GAC). These faculty will not require approval from the George Mason University Foundation (GMUF) or University Administration to serve on the GAC. Prior to gift acceptance, these two faculty will evaluate all major gift agreements\* to funds other than the general fund or general endowment for real or perceived conflicts of interest with regard to faculty governance and academic freedom and autonomy. Given the sensitivity of some donors to anonymity, these faculty will pledge to maintain confidentiality. If these faculty determine there are real or perceived conflicts of interest or risk of violation of academic freedom associated with a gift, pledge, or grant, or associated agreement, the full agreement must be reviewed by the full GAC before acceptance. In the event that the GAC approves a gift in spite of faculty representatives' concerns, the GAC must deliver a report to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. This report shall outline the specific concerns raised by the elected faculty members, and any major points of debate. Representatives of the GAC shall respond to follow-up questions from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. For gifts, pledges, and grants for which the donor or grantor has requested anonymity, donor-identifying information may be redacted from this report.

We call on the Administration to respond to this request and report back to the Faculty Senate at the September 2018 Faculty Senate Meeting.

**\*Definition of "major gift."** We intend this motion to cover the following: (a) any restricted gift with a value greater than \$25,000 OR any gift of any value requiring a "non-standard" gift agreement (as defined by the existing Gift Acceptance Policy); (b) any gift that is given under previously-agreed terms and in which the total amount given exceeds \$25,000 OR in which the previous agreement was "non-standard" in nature; (c) any conditional pledge of any amount, where a "conditional pledge" is defined as "a promise to give only if future and uncertain conditions are met." (See existing Gift Acceptance Policy #1123, Section V, "Ways of Giving.")

## **ATTACHMENT E**

### **FUTURE EFFORTS OF THE ICOIC**

We want to emphasize that the aforementioned motions I and II do not represent the conclusion of our efforts. In the course of our work, we have requested various data from the GMU Foundation. Despite months of waiting, we have yet to receive the inputs and data necessary to inform our efforts. The GMUF has stated that they have been unable to address our questions because of the on-going Transparent GMU lawsuit. Accordingly, we offer this additional motion:

### **III. Motion to Extend**

The charge of the Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee (ICOIC) be extended for one year.

## ATTACHMENT F

### Evaluation of the President and Provost by Faculty Senate Standing Committees, University Standing Committees, and Ad Hoc Committees AY 2017-18

Responses compiled April 2018.

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

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

#### **Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:**

**Academic Policies:** The Provost's office will need to implement some policies from the Dept. of Education involving student attendance. The committee has been notified of this and will be consulted further in the coming months.

**Faculty Matters:** During the past year, the President and Provost have been very cooperative in providing our committee, the Faculty Matters Committee, with information that we requested and in meeting with us when we sought a meeting. We also feel that our committee was consulted appropriately on matters of interest to us. We want to express our sincere appreciation to the President and Provost for their collaborative approach, and have no major concerns to register.

**Nominations:** There were no initiatives, goals or issues accounted by the President or Provost that fall under the charge of the Nominations Committee.

**Organization and Operations:** The Organizations and Operations Committee has only had one related task to the Administration. In most cases, this committee creates new committees that would have direct contact with the offices of the Provost/President.

#### **Responses from University Standing Committees:**

**Academic Appeals:** Not applicable to Academic Appeals Committee.

**Adult Learning and Executive Education:** Yes, the Provost's Office is in the process of hiring a new executive director for the Executive and Professional Education (EPE) program and formed a faculty search committee to evaluate candidates for this position during the spring 2018 semester. The committee was informed about this by an official in the Provost's Office, who also offered to help set a meeting between the committee members and the new director after a candidate has been hired.

**Athletic Council:** Not Applicable.

**Grievance:** NO.

**Faculty Handbook Revision:** No initiatives or goals fell under the charge of the committee.

**Mason Core:** No, there were not any initiatives or goals directly related to the Mason Core announced this year, though the Strategic Plan update has some outcomes that are partly related to the Mason Core.

**Minority and Diversity Issues:** The impact on our committee was the Diversity, Inclusion and Well-Being Summit. I was included to participate in the Summit as well as other committee members. We were not part of planning nor did we have knowledge of this event. It would have been helpful to be involved from the beginning since that is part of our mission.

**Multilingual Academic Support:** There haven't been major initiatives directly related to multilingual students overall (the absence of that kind of discussion is one of the key reasons for forming the committee!). Some significant discussions about the academic structure of INTO Mason have been going on, and the relevant people in INTO Mason (including committee members) have been invited into those discussions; thus, the committee has been aware of the discussions and had an avenue to connect with them. Similar if less intensive discussions about Mason Korea have also filtered down to and then back up through committee members. Janette Muir has been particularly helpful in connecting with the committee about relevant issues. We can foresee, though, that this informal contact might at some point need to become more formal -- as the exact nature of proposed changes to INTO Mason becomes clearer, for example, or as any curricular adjustments that affect Mason Korea get proposed. The committee has no formal charge to provide oversight, but we can be a very useful group for consultation.

**Writing Across the Curriculum:** The Curriculum Impact Grants were initiated last year. The WAC director was invited by the Associate Provost of Undergraduate Education to support the development of these grants. The committee, however, was not involved.

**Ad Hoc Institutional Conflict of Interest Policy:** Not that I'm aware of, N/A.

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

**Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:**

**Academic Policies:** Yes, the committee requested that the Registrar adjust the Summer calendar Add and Drop deadlines so that they are proportional to those for the Fall and Spring. Response was spotty and took a number of months and much committee exertion to complete.

**Nominations:** The Committee sought information from the Provost's staff regarding the appointment to committees of people where the Provost's office has a say in appointments or nominates or appoints individuals to serve on University committees. The staff was helpful and always responded in a timely manner.

**Organization and Operations:** The Organizations and Operations Committee was tasked with the creation of the Faculty Liaison Program, in tandem with JJ Davis and Linda They were very supportive of this new Pilot Training Program. They were very quick to reply to the requests of our committee and were very helpful in connecting us to the appropriate offices for approval. We will propose this Pilot Program in the April 25, 2018 Senate Meeting.

**Responses from University Standing Committees:**

**Academic Appeals:** Not applicable to Academic Appeals Committee.

**Adult Learning and Executive Education:** Yes, the committee requested an interview with an official in the Provost's Office, which was accommodated in a timely fashion.

**Athletic Council:** The Athletic Council has a representative of the President and the Provost office at its meetings and they have been fully involved with the matters of the Council and its sub-committees.

**Faculty Handbook Revision:** The committee had extensive meetings with a representative from the Provost's office. However, we did not have the benefit of the Provost's opinion on some critical suggested revisions until late in year when it became more difficult to discuss and revise in a timely manner. As a result, some changes were not incorporated in this year's extensive revision of P&T sections.

**Grievance:** Our committee is required to submit its findings on faculty grievances to the Provost. During the last twelve months, we have submitted no findings. In the past, however, the Provost has either not responded to the committee or responded very slowly. The Provost is not required to respond, but the committee would like to know how the cases it works on have been evaluated by the Provost.

**Mason Core:** We did not seek information or input this year.

**Minority and Diversity Issues:** Yes, there were several staff contact throughout the year and the responses were timely and supportive.

**Multilingual Academic Support:** We have not sought specific information from these offices. We've been pleased at the support from other offices (e.g. Admissions) when we've requested it.

**Writing Across the Curriculum:** N/A

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

**Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:**

**Academic Policies:** The best interaction is to keep the committee informed of changes, problems, issues in a timely manner.

**Nominations:** There are no recommendations from the Nominations Committee.

**Responses from University Standing Committees:**

**Academic Appeals:** Not applicable to Academic Appeals Committee.

**Adult Learning and Executive Education:** As stated in our committee report, the committee would like to meet with the new director of EPE and other appropriate staff of the Provost's Office in the coming academic year to confer about how this committee might advise and assist in their efforts to expand executive and professional education and adult learning programs as part of the university's strategic plan for 2024.

**Athletic Council:** Can't think of any as they are very responsive when I reach out.

**Faculty Handbook Revision:** The Provost and his representative need to communicate directly with the Faculty Handbook Committee. Although other faculty leaders may offer invaluable perspective, the committee needs to be advised directly about the Provost's opinion on changes. Also, while the FH Committee is responsible for presenting proposed revisions to the Faculty Senate for approval, it cannot likewise inform the Deans. The Deans need to advise the Provost about the proposed revisions and not find out about them in an ad hoc manner from Faculty Senators.

**Grievance:** In the future, it would be most helpful if the Provost would acknowledge receipt of the committee's findings in a timely manner. It would also be helpful to receive a response from the Provost indicating his finding about the cases the committee has submitted. This would help us in the adjudication of future complaints.

**Mason Core:** We already have the Associate Provost of Undergraduate Education as a member of our committee, and she serves as an effective liaison between our committee and the Provost's office.

**Minority and Diversity Issues:** There so many competing priorities and initiatives involved with diversity and inclusion that it would be advisable for the key participants to meet at least quarterly or if not semi-annually for updates and how the faculty senate can become involved.

**Multilingual Academic Support:** Since part of our vision is to see linguistic diversity become one of the many student-diversity markers that are celebrated at Mason -- so that students of all backgrounds who have multiple language fluencies that help them participate in our global society are seen as benefits to the university (as well as receiving support where they may need it) -- we would ultimately like the President, Provost, and their staffs to become comfortable referring to the accomplishments of these students. We're hoping to be able to provide more data to enable such conversations, and to make that available to central administration members at Mason.

**Writing Across the Curriculum:** I'm not certain that the President or Provost have any idea our committee exists. Our work is often overshadowed by initiatives like the those overseen by the SAS/OSCAR office.

**Ad Hoc Institutional Conflict of Interest Policy:** Speaking as chair of the Senate's Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee, I wish the President and Provost, as well as a representative of the Foundation, would meet with the ICOIC, or the entire Senate, to discuss, in general terms, how the University's existing gift-acceptance policy might be revised to allow for adequate faculty governance/participation in gift acceptance procedures and agreements. If not a meeting, then, at least, there should be an extensive written dialogue about these matters in the near future.

This year, the ICOIC tried to arrange for such a meeting and also submitted a set of written questions to the Foundation. (The President and Provost were party to some of these email communications.) We were told such a meeting was impossible because it might involve discussion of issues bearing upon the lawsuit between "Transparent GMU" and the Foundation. We were also told some of our written questions could not be answered, because the information requested was too specific. Although our initial questions were submitted in November, we didn't receive any answers until April 12, and this response only answered some of our questions. We think we will receive additional information, but there's no certainty of this, and no promised timeline.

I believe the President and Provost should assume responsibility to promote a meaningful oral or written dialogue about the University's current gift acceptance policy and how it might be revised to allow for adequate faculty participation. This should occur early in the fall semester. It would be a welcome exercise in shared governance about an important issue of mutual concern and responsibility.

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

**Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:**

**Academic Policies:** The committee discovered that a substantive paragraph in the Permission to Study Elsewhere policy was dropped from the catalog two years ago. The APAC committee, chaired by the Registrar, authorized this without notification to the Faculty Senate, who approved the policy in 2012. The Academic Policies Committee reminds the university community that almost all the policies in the AP section of the University catalog are approved by the Faculty Senate and may not be removed.

Many years ago, the AP Committee was routinely asked to review the AP section of the Catalog. This request has been made only once in the last 7(?) years. The Provost's office and AP Committee need to reinstitute this procedure.

**Nominations:** As noted, the Provost's staff was both helpful and responsive.

**Responses from University Standing Committees:**

**Academic Appeals:** Not applicable to Academic Appeals Committee.

**Adult Learning and Executive Education:** Nothing further to add.

**Faculty Handbook Revision:** The Provost and his representative were extremely helpful in proposing revisions to the Faculty Handbook.

**Grievance:** None.

**Mason Core:** No additional comments.

**Minority and Diversity Issues:** Only to reiterate, that whenever asked the staff was always available and helpful.

**Multilingual Academic Support:** We have no additional information to suggest.

**Writing Across the Curriculum:** As we have had no interactions, there isn't much to say here.

**Ad Hoc Institutional Conflict of Interest Policy:** See my response to #3.