

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday, August 24, 2016, 1:30 – 3:00 p.m., Johnson Center 244

Present: Mark Addleson, Lisa Billingham, Timothy Leslie, Keith Renshaw, Suzanne Slayden, Susan Trencher, Provost David Wu.

I. Approval of Minutes of April 14, 2016: The meeting was called to order at 1:33 p.m. Hearing no changes to the minutes, the minutes were approved.

II. Announcements

- Provost Wu returns from Korea on September 7th. He will briefly review goals for the year at the early October (5th) meeting. He is still finalizing goals with his team (a subset of the President's goals). He will attend an opening ceremony for a new building in (Mason) Korea along with representatives from the University of Utah and University of Ghent. The other two institutions have 20 member delegations each, along with their President. He welcomes new members; a lot of things to do in coming year, and had a number of good meetings with Keith Renshaw over the summer. He wants to get as much engagement with faculty as possible, and is trying to schedule to attend department meetings, department chair meetings, and faculty meetings to have more direct contact with faculty. He sees interaction with Faculty Senate as a centerpiece of this engagement.
- New Senator Orientation will take place Friday, Sept. 2, 2016 , 10-11:00 am, JC 234.
- Rector Davis will address the Faculty Senate on October 5, 2016 and Feb. 1, 2017.
- President Cabrera will address the Faculty Senate on Dec. 7, 2016 and April 5, 2017.
- Emmanuel "Chip" Petricoin replaced Keith Renshaw as Faculty Representative to the BOV Development Committee. He was the (second-place) candidate in the election process for Faculty Representatives to BOV Development Committee.
- Appointment of Officers 16-17: Charlene Douglas will serve as Chair pro tem. Suzanne Slayden will serve as Parliamentarian. Linda Monson and Catherine Sausville will serve as Sergeants-at-Arms.
- Susan Trencher distributed a document for review by Executive Committee members. Discussion and feedback was provided.

III. Progress reports, business, and agenda items from Senate Standing Committees

A. Academic Policies – Suzanne Slayden – Topics for 2016-2017

- **Approval of Academic Calendar:** as we do every year.

- **Admissions – Sr. Citizens transcript requirement. Undergraduate/graduate?** (joint with Admissions Committee)
 - Mason welcomes applications from Virginia's seniors. Under the terms of the *Senior Citizens Higher Education Act of 1974*, eligible Virginia residents, 60 years or older with a taxable income of less than \$23,850 may apply to take university courses for credit in either degree or non-degree seeking status without paying tuition. Admitted senior citizens may register to audit courses regardless of income level.
 - Senior Citizens are required to meet all admission criteria and deadlines detailed in the Undergraduate or Graduate Non-Degree sections above.
 - All Non-degree applicants must complete the online application for admission and supply all official supporting documentation as requested by the Office of Admissions.
 - The minimum standard for Graduate Non-degree admission is a 3.00 cumulative grade point average on the baccalaureate record.
 - Note: The 3.00 standard is not a good one for someone whose UG degree is 1964. The average GPA then was around 2.7, and likely lower in Chemistry, which seems to always have the lowest GPA's of all majors except perhaps for Math. The graduate program is in a better position to determine required GPA, not Admissions.
 - Will be evaluating this issue this year.

- **Grade Appeals section** - Note that the language speaks of "chairs". Needs to be updated to reflect other units where 'heads' are not technically 'chairs.' Will also consider whether there are there other problems that can be addressed in a rewrite?
 - **AP.3.9 Grade Appeals**

Although faculty members are generally the best judges of student performance, there may be times when a student believes a grade is unfair. In such cases, the student should ask the faculty member to reconsider the grade. If the student is not satisfied, an appeal may be made to the head of the unit offering the course (the department chair, institute director, or designee). The recipient of the appeal should ask the student to return to the faculty member who assigned the grade for further consultation.

If the instructor is no longer associated with the university, the local administrator of the unit offering the course will appoint a faculty surrogate, who will assume magisterial authority of the instructor of record at this level of appeal.

If a mutually satisfactory agreement is not reached, the student may request that the chair form a committee of three faculty peers of the faculty member who assigned the grade. If the chair believes the student's complaint is not legitimate, this reservation is reported to the chair's supervisor, usually the dean. No review is conducted unless the dean believes the complaint has merit.

The faculty member or the student may challenge and have replaced one of the three members of the committee without giving a reason for the challenge. The committee meets separately with the faculty member and the student to explore the full particulars of the case. A nonparticipating observer of the student's choice may attend the meeting. Every effort is made to avoid an adversarial relationship.

After the committee has reviewed the case thoroughly, it issues to the chair (with a copy to the faculty member) a written recommendation that includes the reasons for its findings. At this time, the faculty member has an opportunity to take the recommended action, if any. If the matter is not resolved at this point, the chair

considers the committee recommendation and makes a recommendation to the dean. The decision of the dean is not subject to further appeal. If the dean decides that a change of grade is appropriate and the faculty member refuses to make the change, then the dean may direct the Office of the University Registrar to do so.

Grade appeals are not accepted after the last day of classes of the following semester (spring for fall grades, fall for spring and summer grades).\

The Provost's Office does not consider grade appeals, nor does the University Academic Appeals Committee.

- **Posthumous degree award:** Suggested by Janette Muir, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. Some bereaved parents have a lot of expectation, must be handled with much sensitivity.
 - Discussion: How is request initiated? By family? If it comes to our awareness, some criteria could be worked out – whether a certificate of some sort, or baccalaureate (depends on student's progress at time of death – awarding full baccalaureate degree for work not completed is questionable)
- **Proposal received regarding course deletions from catalog** (should be first given to O&O)
 - Proposal to Clean-Up the Course Catalog: A course should be deleted from the Course Catalog if either 1) it has not been taught for eight (8) consecutive semesters (and intervening Summer sessions) and neither the proposer nor the last instructor of the course remains in the offering department; or 2) it has not been taught for twelve (12) consecutive semesters (and intervening Summer sessions), whichever comes first.
 - Discussion: We need to be very careful of taking things off as it is so hard to put in. Decisions generally reached at the college level as in CHSS. Many colleges have their own academic policy committees – but not all. We need to have best practices – an overall policy in place that perhaps provides guidelines of some sort but allows flexibility within colleges. Colleges that do not have policies should.
- **Extension of the Drop Deadline when classes are canceled:** Continuing discussion, we are still waiting for answer from Registrar.
 - A related issue involves cancellation of classes in summer school. Students may enroll in first session of summer school classes just in case they do not pass a class. They receive their grades on Friday before the first session of summer school classes begins on Monday. Then, they drop the summer school class if they have passed their class during the regular semester.
 - There has been a big drop off in summer school enrollment as students who pass courses drop summer school courses at the last minute. This impacts cancellation of classes and students are very unhappy about this.
 - To send this issue also to Organization and Operations for assignment to a committee (potentially Academic Policies).

B. Budget and Resources – Susan Trencher: Last year attended Budget and Resource committee meetings with Sr. VP J.J. Davis. Not all committee members attended these meetings. J.J. wants to talk with the Executive Committee to understand new budget model and to come back to Faculty Senate to discuss new budget model.

C. Faculty Matters – Keith Renshaw: major issues carrying over from AY15-16 include:

1. **Trigger Warning Statement** – work toward simultaneous proposal of the statement on trigger warnings *and* a newly developed statement on the importance of faculty preparation for handling adverse reactions.
2. **Minimum qualifications for department chairs** – work toward proposing revisions to applicable sections of the faculty handbook that provide recommendations for ‘heads of units’ while allowing for variation in best practices across units. The primary issues of concern include term faculty having a ‘vote’ on tenure and promotion, term faculty (whose positions are not secure) feeling undue pressure when confronted with difficult situations that involve tenured faculty, and a lack of uniform review of chairs (regardless of they are tenured, tenure-track, or term).
 - Discussion: In CHSS the only thing term faculty cannot vote on is personnel matters. Not specified in the Faculty Handbook – back in the beginning there were no term faculty.
3. **Tenured faculty being required to generate salary through grants** – pending results of a grievance committee issue last year, FM will determine whether to take any action on this issue.

D. Nominations – Mark Addleson: We have just about filled the vacancies. There is one vacancy on the Nominations Committee.

- It might be a good idea in the future to ask committee members whose terms expire if they wish to continue to serve on a particular committee.

E. Organization and Operations – Lisa Billingham

- Chair Keith Renshaw announced we learned today of the election of two Faculty Senators from the Antonin Scalia Law School. Election results are pending for one Senator from S-CAR: Dean Avruch will let us know after their first Faculty meeting.
- **Outstanding items:**
 - **Multilingual Task Force** : Email from Mark Houck over summer: “O&O was charged by the Senate to produce marching orders for a new Council on Multilingual Student Support. We did everything requested except for the last step: get feedback from the original Task Force on the proposed charge and membership for the Council. The appended email is the request to Shelley Reid, chair of the Task Force, to gain the needed feedback. Shelley has not responded to the Apr 12 or May 3 requests for input. Perhaps she is on leave or otherwise occupied. Perhaps some other member(s) of the Task Force should be contacted”
 - What was written by O&O last year:

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF “Council on Multilingual Student Support”

Charge:

To oversee and coordinate support for multilingual learners and faculty through:

- **Direct student resources support:** offering classes and tutoring services for students with varying language needs (writing, speaking, listening, and reading), and where appropriate advising students of other beneficial services in the broader community
- **Faculty development support:** enhancing teaching of linguistically diverse students across the curriculum
- **Administrative support:** enabling key programs to lead specialized curriculum and faculty development efforts
- **Centralized, collaborative oversight:** prioritizing, synchronizing, and assessing efforts across the network of multilingual education programs at Mason

Composition: The membership of the Committee includes one elected representative from each academic unit and ex officio members from the following areas:

- Writing Center
- Composition
- Basic Communication Courses
- Center for Teaching and Faculty Excellence
- WAC
- Libraries
- INTO
- Academic Advising and Transitions Center

¹ Here is one example of resources from the broader community:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/library/ell/languageclasses.htm>

- Discussion: Does not imply that resources would be forthcoming – an empty experience for faculty asked to serve on it unless we have some sense of it. Using example of collaborative class of Anthropology and INTO. Compared to old English Language Institute (ELI), we don't know what INTO contract looks like. INTO gives them workload, much higher than ELI. We have asked to see INTO contract (30 year contract).
- Provost Wu responded we did have discussion of this, we did put in budget request for this year, funding request – haircut versions of budget; part of it is still intact under general umbrella of diversity and inclusion; and this is under the umbrella. Funding in a bigger pot of money =- did try to make this into the budget. Budget process becoming more and more complex - still not confirmed funding with Richmond.
- Chair Renshaw stated he is trying to encourage a broader workload of committee work, not just chairs. Encouraged Lisa to work to engage committee members in helping.
- Professor Trencher noted Budget and Resources has three meetings with JJ: she was the only person to attend all three meetings. Chairs do end up doing a lot of the work. Less possible to have convenient meetings with JJ, not just to put on resumé, need to do committee service.

- **Librarians Council:** The Librarians Council, a self governing body of approximately 43 professional faculty members, is interested in discussing the possibility of being members of the Faculty Senate.
 - Discussion: This is a faculty senate, not a university senate. Librarians are not faculty; should not serve as representatives of a committee making recommendations where they are not faculty. Librarians were once faculty. Some of the librarians have degrees who teach courses for departments.
 - Chair Renshaw will reply to the initiator of the request.

IV. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

- **Faculty Handbook Committee – Suzanne Slayden.** The Faculty Handbook Committee has not actually reported in three years. We had a lot of work to do in the beginning. Some in Faculty Senate saw no reason to wave flag in front of BOV -- some boards might see it as an opportunity to make other changes. Now things are beginning to pile up. Department chair issues, among other things, not big issues, but things need to be changes. She would like to announce at September meeting we will bring up Faculty Handbook business enough in advance – and a little bit at a time – for faculty to review.
 - Discussion: Concerns expressed about procedures for Grievance and University Promotion, Tenure and Renewal Appeal (UPTRAC) Committees over the summer.
 - Each committee encouraged to get together with published procedures sooner rather than later.
 - Is this a problem with framework or more a problem with interpretation and the need to move on it?
 - We also need to close the door a little bit – this is not to open door to changing the entire Faculty Handbook.
 - Provost Stearns was very good at handling BOV to downplay Faculty Handbook as faculty contract of employment, a low key approach, and then it got out of line.

V. New Business, Updates, and Discussion

- **2FA – Marilyn Smith (Vice President and Chief Information Officer):** A new technical requirement for Virtual Private Network (VPN) – using a second authentication – university sends you a one-time pin to use to approve on your cell phone (or app, can also do on a one-time phone). Hacking issues occurred, caught quickly.
 - The committee concurred it was not necessary to ask Marilyn Smith (CIO) to come to a Faculty Senate meeting to talk about this. We need to give it time to see how it works
 - There have been references to \$89M upgrade, but hear about too many things don't work. Stanley Zoltek and the Technology Policy Committee are working on this.
- **Kumar Raghuraman (Associate Provost, Institutional Research and Assessment) – online teaching evaluations:** Chair Renshaw met yesterday with Kumar. He wishes to present to the Faculty Senate in October. Kumar's thoughts on this issue are different than what we have heard before. His rationale is more along the lines of sustainability (e.g., wasted paper) – he explicitly stated that cost should not be an issue when it comes to issues of teaching.
 - The EXC concurred cost should not influence teaching matters (including evaluations).

- Kumar truly seems to want input, and has met twice with the Effective Teaching Committee; he wants Faculty Senate feedback.
- The Effective Teaching Committee wishes to report separately at the September 7th meeting.
- Dr. Kumar was originally on the September schedule, but he will not be ready for the September meeting.
- Discussion: Information needs to be distributed well in advance of meeting. Give Dr. Kumar all the issues faculty have brought up in the past.
- Are comments used for evaluation? A friend submitted a FOIA request for an EXC member's evaluations. FOIA response stated comments were read by his chair and not FOIABLE. – Confidentiality violations occur with some regularity (does this mean only faculty member may read comments?)
- From a process standpoint – for evaluation form comments to be made confidential or not? ... If they are going to continue to be read by chair, a serious confidentiality issue – not to be treated cavalierly.
- Because this is a teaching matter, faculty has a big dog in this fight, depends on who does them, what questions are asked, etc.
- Overall response rates very low compared to paper evaluations.
 - Some universities require students to answer before grades received, faculty will be blamed for that.
- In response to Provost Wu's observation: "procedurally you need to have the charged committee to do the work", Senator Slayden responded the committee reports back to the Faculty Senate, they do not make the decision. (Provost Wu had to depart at this time).
- Chair Renshaw will check with Dr. Kumar to see if there is urgency in his timeframe.
- Faculty Senate Forum with Administrators – 34 responses
 - Budget Model – 142
 - Term/Adjunct – 140
 - Online teaching – 131
 - INTO – 106
 - Mason Korea – 92
 - Goal to allow greater time for discussion, received 34 responses out of 47 Senators polled.
 - To pick up an off-cycle time on a Wednesday afternoon; also to distribute stuff ahead of time?
 - Discussion included:
 - Term/Adjunct faculty is a raging issue in higher education especially with respect to Research I grant activity. Will move teaching responsibilities elsewhere. In terms of sheer numbers and conditions, how adjuncts and term faculty are treated.
 - Interested in all of the topics listed. We cannot as a faculty lead on this? What are the president and provost's views?
 - Re Adjunct FTE point of view 49% wants to hear more of a presentation first and then Q&A re vision . Another agrees with this, does not think President/Provost have clear answer now. .. if they don't have a vision, that's worse, if they are just going down the stream, muddling through...
 - Suggests involvement of Faculty Matters committee – a few steps, not long term, does not know what answer is.

- Budget model will change things in this way: Deans will control what used to come from central – will dismantle low enrollment units. Faculty already tenured will be put into other units.
- We set a 2:2 load in CHSS partially because we could not get into Research I category without it – now have to rely more on term/adjunct.
- One possible implication of budget model is that faculty who don't get enough research grants might have to take on more teaching responsibilities.
- Budget model has serious implications for what is going to happen to faculty and not just faculty salaries, but also teaching in terms of how much money faculty bring in.
- Even if we can't get any commitment from President/Provost – does faculty have a position/commitment on this?
- KR: From procedural standpoint: Budget Model and its implication may inform opinions and thoughts on the overarching issues related to term/adjunct faculty. Maybe we should organize presentations forums this way:
 - First background on what the new Budget Model is and how it works
 - Then background on implications of the new budget model for VPs, deans and others at college level, university level.
 - Then maybe we can proceed to more in-depth discussion of term/adjunct?
- Many are upset at Budget Model – need more information, including how old# compare to new #s. Then to have a new discussion.
- We asked JJ to come up with a markup – they don't yet know the numbers
- Why don't they know?
- Each unit will get money based on a different formula. JJ knows budget issues, but doesn't know universities. This seems like an “eat what you kill (or maybe ‘what is dying’) model. STR believes JJ is on a learning curve – she intended to get a group of faculty input, has a lot of work to do in not enough time. STR believes JJ thinks everybody trusts their dean, but they don't. There were lots of other budget models in university – where units control their money – STR feels JJ legitimately does not know the answer yet. This coming year (AY16-17) is the first year of using budgets side by side
- KR: Maybe we should have an overview of what the process is (what we know and don't know) in a regular FS meeting, and then proceed to implications, etc. He asks EXC to percolate on this before JJ comes to EXC.
- Side discussion: We need to try to get more business in FS – it should be reported (and consequently in the minutes) that committees are working on issue(s) as opposed to “no report”. Would like to see more details.
- Proposals from Donor Task Force ([Attachment D](#), [Attachment E](#))
 - Discussion: To develop a Task Force (see pp. 10-12). Would go to O&O to design what it would look like. Thinks others may want to work on it, represents a unique opportunity to come together and get something done.
 - Two populations – constitution of committee on one side or other and everyone bound by vote – implication faculty may or may not agree with decisions – needs to be careful management of transparency.
 - Do we need to say anything to address the fact that resolution from last Spring is not being acted upon?

- Yes - after Donor TF presents a report, FS should vote to dismiss their committee with thanks.
- Ask DK to write it as he is asking for it to be dissolved.
- KR to send suggestions to DK.
- SS will not get involved (in new proposed committee).
- Background Check Report AY15-16 ([Attachment F](#)) will be included in the agenda.
- Continuing topics of discussion from EXC meeting 4-14-16
 - Drop deadlines (Provost Wu was going to follow up with Eve Dauer to see if she could provide any further information on Suzanne's questions).
 - Consideration of faculty input on Student Experience Study – not discussed
 - Consideration of adding Indigenous People's Day to calendar ([Attachment G](#))
 - Nothing to act on from FS Executive Committee point of view
 - KR to respond

VI. Agenda Items for September 7, 2016 FS Meeting

- Draft FS Minutes April 27, 2016, May 4, 2016
- Announcements
- Committee Reports
 - Report from the Effective Teaching Committee - move to new business, so elections come first
- Nominees to the Faculty Senate Standing Committees and University Standing Committees; Faculty Representatives to Committees
 - Note – should be Special Orders, which would come *after* Committee Reports
- Background Check Report for AY 15-16 – Linda Harber/Jessica Cain
- Post Meeting Election of Chairs of Faculty Senate Standing Committees

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 3:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meg Caniano

Faculty Senate clerk

ATTACHMENT D

Outstanding elements of the resolution sponsored by Senator David Kuebrich:

2. The Senate *ad hoc* Task Force on Donor Relations present the Senate at its first fall meeting with a detailed COI policy applicable to private donations.
3. The Senate *ad hoc task* Force on Donor Relations present the Senate at its first fall meeting with a detailed proposal for a committee charged with approving the creation and/or expansion of GMU affiliated centers and with monitoring their ongoing activities as well as those of already existing centers.

ATTACHMENT E

Email from David Kuebrich (8/22/2016)

I don't presently have proposals for policies that address A) issues of academic integrity associated with private donors and B) the approval and monitoring of academic centers. Part of the reason for not having these is that I didn't spend a lot of the summer working on these projects. Also, it turns out that what I was counting on as big helps aren't helpful, at least not yet. I thought I would be able to draw upon a new gift-review policy developed by the Western Carolina University faculty senate, but although the WCU senate has developed a policy with many good features, including guidelines for dealing with private funding directed to centers and extra-curricular programs (I say this based on the limited information I have of the policy), it has agreed with its administration to not release a working draft of the policy until the administration has had more time to review it and provide feedback.

Another problem is that I thought I would be able to turn to Vanderbilt University's comprehensive policy statement regarding conflicts of interest and commitment. I had closely reviewed an earlier version of their COI policy several years ago, and I liked it a lot--especially points it made about the importance of preserving a university's "intangible assets" (for example, its reputation for objective instruction and research that serves the public good). However, when I went back to it this summer, I found it inadequate. The reason for my changed opinion is that I've subsequently read the AAUP's recent (2014) book-length discussion of principles and guidelines for dealing with COIs. The AAUP (rightly) calls for much greater degrees of transparency and faculty governance than are present in Vanderbilt's policy.

Further complicating the situation is the fact that we have some fairly unique issues at GMU--issues that I don't believe the AAUP or any other organization or individual has adequately addressed. We are a public university that hosts centers that actively attempt to build a libertarian movement that will transform American political culture and influence the federal government to radically lower taxes and regulations. An increasing number of other schools (including WCU) now also have similar (but smaller) centers or programs, based on the GMU model, but none have the funding that GMU has and none are so active in attempting to influence the federal government. Accordingly, we GMU faculty need to devise an appropriate response to our particular situation.

Given the above, I can't provide the Senate with proposed policies re private donors and campus centers. Instead, I can draft a motion to create a committee to address these issues. To explain what such a committee might look like, I'm pasting in excerpts from an email I today sent to Aurali Dade, who has responded that she is willing to collaborate on this project. We plan to talk further tomorrow morning. (I hasten to add that I'm not implying that Aurali shares my views about the situation here at GMU. I'm merely stating that she seems willing to work with a Senate committee that will attempt to develop guidelines for dealing with private donations and campus centers.)

Aurali:

Here's what I want to propose for your consideration in your capacity as Assistant VP for Research. Please give me your best advice. I'm new at this business, and I need all the help I can get. (I do, however, think I've developed a reasonably good understanding of the AAUP's perspective on faculty governance and policy guidelines for eliminating/managing COIs and preserving academic integrity.)

I'm currently thinking we should develop a committee charged with creating a comprehensive, university-wide COI (and perhaps commitment) policy that would include sections on private donors and campus centers. This strikes me as a cleaner approach than creating two new policies in isolation that might introduce unnecessary duplication and perhaps prove to have details that contradict some aspects of existing policies. (If we don't develop a fully comprehensive policy, we might at least develop a policy that consistently integrates private donor and center policies with existing policies.)

I am thinking of a committee of five faculty elected by the Faculty Senate and one or more administrators--with you being key. I think of you as indispensable because you likely have the best overall understanding of Mason's existing COI policies and research guidelines. And you have a professional background in this area. Also, I just read your interview, "From Conflict to Collaboration," and it seems you possess negotiation skills that always come in handy.

This morning I emailed two members--Suzanne Slayden and Zach Schrag--of the ORIA Faculty Advisory Board, asking if they would agree to serve on the proposed committee. Now I'm waiting for their replies. I'm confident both would be excellent committee members. I've also asked them to suggest other possible members, ideally from schools other than COS and CHSS. I also warmly welcome your suggestions for faculty and/or administrative members.

Creating a substantive COI (and commitment) policy that includes private donors and centers is, I believe, an extremely important and urgent task. At the same time, however, I don't think developing such a policy would be too time-consuming. I think we can draw upon four resources to help us with the project:

- 1) Mason's existing policies and guidelines;
- 2) the background knowledge of faculty and administrators who have dealt with these issues in the past (assuming some will agree to serve on the committee);
- 3) policy statements from other universities;
- 4) relevant passages from "Recommended Principles," a recent (2014) book-length AAUP study that addresses many COI concerns.

[David]

I can provide a motion for creating such a committee at the first Senate meeting. However, I would prefer to do so at the second meeting. By that time, I think I will have access to the WCU document and, hopefully, some useful policy statements that have been developed by other schools.

Let me know how you wish to proceed.

Best,
Dave

ATTACHMENT F
Faculty Senate Report – Criminal Background Checks
Fiscal Year 2016

1. How many criminal background checks were conducted between July 1 last year and June 30 this year?

A total of 1,369 background checks were completed for the university during this timeframe. We switched to a new vendor, Truescreen, March 1st of this year.

HireRight: 690

Truescreen: 679

2. How many criminal background checks covered full-time faculty? Adjunct faculty?

165 full-time faculty and 120 adjunct faculty

3. How many potential employees or individuals changing positions within the university refused to allow HR&P to conduct background checks? How many of these were potential or actual faculty members?

No one refused to complete a background check.

4. How many individuals failed to be hired or to change positions within the university because of the outcome of background checks? How many of these were faculty?

There was one (1) instance of background check results impacting the hire or re-hire of an individual. This instance did *not* involve a faculty member.

5. How many people were terminated due to background checks? How many of these were faculty? Without compromising confidentiality, what were the bases of these actions?

One (1) person was terminated as a result of the background check. This person was *not* a faculty member. The basis was Mason job duties and the conviction.

6. How much did it cost the university to conduct background checks during the reporting period?

The cost for background checks during this period was approximately \$54,800. The average cost for background checks with HireRight was \$50. The average cost for background checks with Truescreen (new vendor) is \$27.

HireRight: \$36,500

Truescreen: \$18,300

7. Were there any violations of confidentiality or other aspects of the Background Investigation Policy during the reporting period? Without compromising confidentiality, explain.

There were no violations of confidentiality.