

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, November 19, 2018, 10:30 a.m. -12:00 p.m.
SUB I, room 3A

Present: Lisa Billingham, Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Shannon Davis, Tim Leslie, Keith Renshaw, Suzanne Slayden, Girum Urgessa.

I. Approval of Minutes of September 17 and October 19, 2018: deferred to our next meeting.

II. Announcements

Rector Davis will attend the December 5, 2018 FS Meeting

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

A. Academic Policies – Suzanne Slayden

To follow up on drop date deadline, Provost Office to schedule meeting of the Policy Management Committee. We have received three items from the Registrar:

-1- Summer Calendar for 2019.

-2- When students never attend (NA) or stop attending (SA) class, eventually become Fs. NA would become an NP (never participate). Protects faculty from evaluation – too many F's. Will count as attempted hours, has financial aid implications, but not GPA "F" grade.

-3- Selective Withdrawal – recommend they look into selective withdrawal date until end of classes (as does Virginia Tech). Registrar group discussed it and will be making a firm proposal for change next semester. New "W" from day after drop date to beginning of selective withdrawal periods – as many as you want.... With selective withdrawal, can only do it three times in your academic career. Called "a selective withdrawal" 5 weeks. The AP Committee asks for your input.

B. Budget and Resources – Tim Leslie

Distributed draft Budget Model FY 2018 College and School Revenues and Expenditures Information, with FY 2019 Fund Balance by School, along with categories of Expenditures/Commitments, specific dollar amounts, or priorities (for some colleges and schools still in early conversation on the level of funding).

We have asked for more details (100+ line item budget for each college/school), they are working with us. Trying to be flexible in working with David Moore (Asst. Vice President and Chief Budget Officer, Office of Budget and Planning) and Tom Calhoun (Interim Sr. Vice President for Administration and Finance).

C. Faculty Matters – Girum Urgessa

Faculty Evaluation of Administrators: Statistics on participation rates (2010-2018- so far) were distributed. Right now we are historically on the lower end; survey to close December 4th. We have been sending reminders every two weeks to those who have not participated. The next reminder goes out after Thanksgiving. We are requesting more information, how to summarize.

Evaluation of Dept. Chairs: we visited dept. chairs group a few weeks ago, asking for their input on the idea of routine evaluations of chairs. Department chairs all are interested in getting feedback, but some concern about mechanism. He asked the EXC committee for feedback. Primary idea at this point: To have policy in Faculty Handbook that deans have to provide opportunity for faculty to provide feedback (about dept. chairs).

Discussion: Worthwhile to put into Faculty Handbook to make it happen. Dept chairs also asked if they could also give feedback on Associate Deans.

Why not ask the President, Provost and Deans to respond to the Faculty Evaluation of Administrators? (not on the Senate floor). The Faculty Matters Committee met with Provost Wu, once summary of FEA completed, will ask him to respond. Should we include time for both President and Provost to respond at FS meetings? Some feel this takes too much time from meeting. This year is different, questions are different, open-ended. Also noted Provost Wu has his own blog. Chair Keith Renshaw will ask Provost Wu's opinion in terms of individuals' response.

One EXC member likes idea of verbal, but Provost has done his blog, etc.

KR: We just need to structure it (department chair eval), put parameters around. To reach out to deans, ask Provost Wu's opinion, because he will tell the deans what they have to do. Maybe as a metric, ask deans if they evaluated feedback received for dept. chairs?

D. Nominations – Melissa Broeckelman-Post – nothing to report, finally!

E. Organization and Operations – Lisa Billingham

Faculty Liaison Pilot Training Team

We need help to pare down 300 tenured faculty teaching at least a 2:2 load – if you are only teaching one class, chair may not let them be released. How to predicate re nominees?

Discussion: Why do you feel you have to do that? Why not just call for nominations? Lisa recounts history of no list first, to a list that is way too big.

To put out a call for applications? What information do you want to have to evaluate these people? To identify people to start as a pilot? Not to stop with 2:2, 3:3 teaching load, there are faculty who will go lower. A lot may depend on chairs. Also to make sure to have pattern of what training will consist of.

Athletic Council charge: We are working with the Athletic Council making progress on revising their charge. Dominique Banville (Faculty Athletic Representative and Chair) will meet with the Athletic Council in January.

Proposed Changes to Minority and Diversity Issues Committee Name and Charge

To: Senate Executive Committee

From: Virginia S. Blair DHA, RN, CPHQ

Chair, Minority and Diversity Issues Committee

Date: November 15, 2018

Re: Background for Proposed Changes to Committee Name and Charge

The Minority and Diversity Issues Committee during Academic Year 2017-2018 concluded that there was not a well-established charge for the committee. This decision was reached as the result of spending the entire academic year meeting with various organizations throughout the campus. It was further evident that there was redundancy in various campus organizations with but no clear vision for the Minority and Diversity Committee except on the periphery. As a result, it was recommended that the committee be dissolved or integrated into an already existing Senate committee.

During the summer (2018), administrative personnel and faculty meet to discuss Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Well-Being. As a result of this meeting, the Faculty Senate Minority and Diversity Issues Committee was assigned to review the name and charge of the existing committee and submit its recommendations to the Senate O&O Committee.

In the fall (2018), the committee membership was changed, and the first order of business was to review the existing name and charge of the committee. Reviewing the work of the former committee, it was unanimously decided that the concentration needed to be faculty. It was further identified that there are numerous organizations throughout the campus for students, but there was not a voice or support for minority faculty. It was further determined that the Office of Compliance, Diversity and Ethics would be the perfect partner for this revised name and charge change.

The revised name and charge that you see before you today were reached by consensus with the current members of the Minority and Diversity Issues Committee, and has been endorsed by Julian Williams and Rose Pascarell. Both of these leaders have agreed to partner with the

committee as it moves forward pending the approval of the name and charge change. Next week I will be meeting with Kim Eby to seek additional support.

The Senate Minority and Diversity Issues Committee is asking for your support and endorsement of the name and charge change so that it can move forward with establishing a work plan for spring, 2019.

Current Charge

Minority and Diversity Issues Committee

To work in concert with the Office of Compliance, Diversity and Ethics and the Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Multicultural Education (ODIME), other pertinent administrators, and campus organizations in developing and implementing means to ensure nondiscrimination, inclusion, and protection of the rights of all persons affiliated with the University; and to facilitate dialogue among those connected with the University and those in the broader community on matters concerning marginalized populations and diversity issues.

Proposed Charge

Faculty Equity and Inclusion Committee (FEIC)

Partner with the Office of Compliance, Diversity and Ethics to foster equity and inclusion among the faculty with the goal of improving recruitment, retention, and overall well-being of minority faculty members.

Discussion:

- Suggestion that committee look at review by O&O of committee charges by Star Muir (see Faculty Senate Minutes April 23, 2014, p. 4).
- How does Ginny define “partner with,” replacing “in concert with”?
- To replace “minority faculty members” with “faculty members from underrepresented groups”?
- Underrepresented groups may be different among colleges.
- “to foster equity” – do we have demonstrated inequities to address? Service load for some faculty higher taxed(?)
- Are there specific inequities in GMU? Yes, but what does this mean? Crusading force? Very broad role, not sure what they want to do.

IV. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

- Faculty Handbook Committee is working on issue where tenured faculty member was fired, Section 2.6.2 Post Tenure Review and Section 2.9.3 Termination of Appointment of Tenured, Tenure-Track and Term Faculty Members for Cause.

V. New Business, Updates, and Discussion

- Effective Teaching Committee – wishes to present at December meeting. We have not received their report yet. They also requested not to present at same meeting as the CEHD pilot group.
- Follow-up Representation for Mason Korea, INTO, and UNIV Course Faculty O&O is researching other public campuses' similarities.
- Resolution from the Student Senate: Campus-Wide Initiative to Make Mason a Conflict Free Campus see [Attachment A](#)
Discussion: Kudos to the Student Senate for doing something like this. We are intrigued in spirit, but need some background information and clarification “including an option that grants students and faculty access to conflict-free products when selecting electronic vendors”. Chair Renshaw will contact the Student Senate.
- IHS Linked Documents, see [Attachments B and C](#)
Discussion: To ask Marilyn Smith (VP and CIO) whether use of private email server separate from the state university system (even though it uses the gmu.edu domain name) is FOIA-able? Also Mercatus.gmu.edu is a gmu.edu name server, does this make it a state product? Concern expressed about affiliated centers with their own fundraising separate from Mason. Chair Renshaw will also follow up with Provost Wu. Chair Renshaw to report back to EXC.
- Interviews for the Senior Vice President will take place during the week of December 3rd. We were asked to provide one member of the Executive Committee and one member of the Budget & Resources Committee to participate in interviews.
- The Adjunct Task Force wants to meet on their recommendations. We need a representative from Faculty Matters to attend.
- The ICOIC is working on its response to the Provost's report (November 5th FS Meeting). Matt Karush is taking over as chair of the committee.

VI. Agenda Items for December 5, 2018 FS Meeting

- Draft FS Minutes November 7, 2018
- Rector Davis
- Provost Wu
- Announcements
- Committee Reports
 - Executive Committee – brief report on IHS, to follow up with report by February

- Academic Policies – Summer 2019 calendar (if available)
- Budget and Resources – Budget Model
- O&O –Minority and Diversity Committee charge revision/name change
- Effective Teaching Committee
- ICOIC response to Report on the Internal Review Committee on Gift Agreements
- New Business

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned approximately 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Meg Caniano
Faculty Senate clerk

Attachment A

**A Resolution to Support George Mason University Becoming a
Conflict Free Campus**

R. #XX

39th STUDENT SENATE

1st Session

R. #XX

A Resolution to Support George Mason University Becoming a Conflict Free Campus

IN THE STUDENT SENATE OF GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

Month DD, YYYY

Sponsored by: Chairman Cone Co-
Sponsored by: Chairman Price

Resolution #XX

Be it resolved by the Student Senate of George Mason University—

Whereas, George Mason University has a commitment to sustainability, innovation, research of consequence, economic and cultural engine, engagement with the world, and the strengthening of the Mason brand nationally and internationally

Whereas, the mining of minerals in a way that perpetuates human rights violations in areas such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and,

Whereas, these “conflict minerals” include cobalt, tin, tungsten, and tantalum; and,

Whereas, socially responsible companies have already begun to monitor their supply chains to limit or eliminate the practice of mining “conflict minerals”; and,

Therefore, be it resolved, that Student Government supports George Mason University prioritizing companies that trace, audit, and certify their supply chains; and,

Therefore, be it further resolved, that we are not looking to exclude countries or companies

but ensure George Mason University continues to honor its commitment to freedom and learning, through its procurement policy including an option, that grants students and faculty access to conflict-free products when selecting electronic vendors.

Passed the Student Senate: _____

Attest:

Speaker: Davide Genoese-Zerbi

Clerk: Jeremy Aylward

Attachment B

I pass along some information that is directly relevant to the Transparent GMU case.

It is a little-known secret on campus that two Koch organizations are set up on their own private email server that is separate from the state university system even though it uses the gmu.edu domain name. Their email server is run off the private domain: chims.net.

A digital forensics expert could easily confirm this from public info by looking in the right places. You can also check the address on its whois entry (and who was housed in that office on campus at that time and the other domains they own). It is identical to the whois for the Koch orgs.

The Koch server runs by bouncing emails off the gmu.edu site without them ever going through the GMU mail system. It masks their origin and destination. So:

If you sent an email to FIRSTLAST@ihs.gmu.edu it actually goes to FIRSTLAST@chims.net

And if someone at FIRSTLAST@chims.net replies it is received from FIRSTLAST@ihs.gmu.edu

All using gmu.edu but avoiding GMU's own mail client.

Since gmu.edu emails are eligible under the Virginia FOI act you can see how it may be convenient to have a private server.

Only a few IT people know it exists. The person in charge of it on the Koch end is named Todd Hathaway. Koch org executives Chamley-Wright and Thevenot know about the arrangement. So do a few people in GMU admin.

Please understand my need for anonymity.

- GMU IT whistleblower

Attachment C

May 15 00 12:58a

p.2

Talent ID Rubric

Version 2.0 4/15/16

CL Sympathy – This is about both the amount people agree with the Classical Liberal (CL) framework and their likelihood of becoming more CL sympathetic through discussion. Probably our most important metric, most program invitations start with filtering for sympathy.

5 – On board. Broad and strong agreement with the CL framework (markets, property rights, political and economic freedom). Libertarians, anarcho-capitalists, Objectivists, Rothbardians, consequentialists with libertarian conclusions.

4 – Market-friendly. Agrees with many CL ideas (including the power of markets) and is open to new ideas. Inclined to support freedom-enhancing policies though may be inconsistent. Conservatives with principled support for markets.

3 – Open. Agrees with some CL ideas and is open to discussion; sympathy for markets is weak or non-apparent. Open-minded liberals, civil libertarians, or conservatives with weak market support (pro-subsidies, anti-free trade); or someone new to thinking about CL ideas.

2 – Skeptical/Apathetic. Finds little value in CL ideas. Someone who disagrees more than agrees with CL ideas and is open to discussion but is not easily swayed; or doesn't agree or disagree but also doesn't care.

1 – Hostile. Agreement on few if any CL ideas and not open to discussion.

CL Knowledge – An understanding of the concepts, figures, and framework holds more weight than mere exposure to them. It is expected that people will be familiar with most of the examples listed in scores lower than the one they receive. Low CL Knowledge scores will not prevent people from attending IHS programs but will guide program owners to place them into programs appropriate for that knowledge level.

5 – Exceptionally high knowledge. In-depth understanding of CL figures, concepts, and framework, including strong interdisciplinary CL knowledge across more than two fields (economics, philosophy, political science, history). A person at this level of CL knowledge would be ready for participating in and contributing to our most advanced programs.

4 – High knowledge. Familiar with CL figures, concepts, and framework and has an understanding of how they tie together. May be exceptionally knowledgeable in a given field but only somewhat knowledgeable in other fields; or may be knowledgeable across multiple fields but lacks an in-depth understanding of or familiarity with the concepts or figures. May have familiarity with or understanding of (4 or more): Mises, Rothbard, Spooner, Nozick, Buchanan, well-known Liberty Friendly Faculty (Sowell, Caplan, Cowen), spontaneous order, knowledge problem, institutional analysis, opportunity cost, comparative advantage, marginal utility, law vs. legislation, common law, public choice theory, deontology vs. consequentialism, or social contract vs. evolution.

3 – Somewhat knowledgeable. Familiar with CL figures, concepts, and framework and has a basic understanding of how they tie together. May have familiarity with or understanding of (4 or more): Hayek, Milton Friedman, Bastiat, Adam Smith, incentives, trade/exchange, rule of law, rights, morality, or justice.

2 – Low knowledge. Scarcely familiar with CL figures, concepts, or framework. May be familiar with figures or concepts but lacks an understanding of how they tie together into a larger framework; or may be familiar with a basic liberty framework but is not familiar with many figures or concepts. May have cursory familiarity with: Ron Paul, Ayn Rand, John Locke, JS Mill, Tea Party, or the Founding Fathers.

1 – Exceptionally low knowledge. Not at all familiar with CL figures, concepts, or framework. Confuses figures or concepts or doesn't know of them in the first place.

Career Direction – Serious intent and future plans are weighted more than current career stage. This metric is important for funneling participants into the appropriate programs and for ensuring we are prioritizing our investment efforts on students more likely to enter one of our supported careers. Supportable careers include: academia (humanities and social sciences, especially economics, philosophy, political science, history), public policy, ideological nonprofit, public interest law, politics, k-12 education, journalism/new media, creative/fiction writing, film/tv production, or publishing.

5 – Definitely supportable. There is no doubt that this person will be in this supportable career for the long-term. Established in their career with no intent to change paths. Academia: a late stage PhD student with strong intent to become an academic; or an established faculty member. Public interest law: working in the field.

4 – Supportable. In an internship or applying to jobs in a supported field; early career. Academia: applying to grad school; early grad school. Public interest law: already in law school with public interest law plan and has internship or clerkship; or applying to jobs in the field.

3 – Undecided. A supportable career is possible but the person is still deciding; or has no idea what they want to end up doing; or has interests but hasn't taken any serious steps towards the intended career. Academia: interested but hasn't picked field or grad programs. Public interest law: interested but hasn't picked law programs; or a current law student with interest but no actions made in this direction.

2 – Not supportable. In an internship or applying to jobs in an unsupported field; early career. Academia (unsupported field): applying to grad school; early grad school. Law (not public interest): applying to law school or already in law school with serious intent on this direction; or applying to jobs in the field.

1 – Definitely not supportable. There is no doubt that this person will be in this unsupportable career for the long-term. Established in their career with no intent to change paths. Academia (unsupported field): a late stage PhD student with strong intent to become an academic; or an established faculty member. Law (not public interest): working in the field.

IHS Values – This measures a person's moral character as relevant to working with others, specifically IHS. This score indicates IHS's willingness to put its credibility on the line in recommending this person to future IHS programs and/or allies. This is used as a catch-all for signaling any undesirable personality traits with low scores or highly desirable personality traits with high scores.

5 – Exceptionally high values. History of undeniable trustworthiness and reliability; humble, non-dogmatic; would not hesitate to recommend.

4 – High values. History of demonstrating good values at multiple programs and with multiple staff.

3 – Average values. Limited evidence based on few interactions; or nothing particularly good or bad that stands out.

2 – Low values. Suspect. Limited evidence of low values based on few interactions. Still willing to give the person a chance but may prioritize this person lower than someone with no value score. Would hesitate to recommend.

1 – Exceptionally low values. Dishonorable. Unreliable, dishonest, verbal/physical abuse, significant misconduct. Would recommend against. This person should be marked Inactive – Internal and have no further relationship or communication with IHS.

Intellectual/Creative Ability – This metric is unique in that it should be thought of as relative to others in the person's cohort (age group, career stage, or career type). This is important for inviting top tier participants to more intensive programs and for prioritizing investments in people whose raw ability makes them more likely to succeed in their career.

- 5 – Exceptionally high ability.** Superstar. Has demonstrated exceptional intellect, creativity, and insight; very likely to make a mark in the world. Undeniably investment-worthy.
- 4 – High ability.** Talented. Very likely to succeed. Investment-worthy.
- 3 – Average ability.** Still has potential to succeed. Nothing significant stands out as particularly high or low ability. Potentially worth investment.
- 2 – Low ability.** Subpar. Aptitude necessary to succeed is noticeably low. Likely not worth investment.
- 1 – Exceptionally low ability.** Nonstarter. Lacking in raw firepower. Not worth investment.

Communication Skills – This measures a person's ability to communicate ideas and to persuade an audience both on paper and in person. This is important for identifying people, particularly future faculty, who are great communicators.

- 5 – Exceptionally high communication skills.** Excellent. Has demonstrated outstanding skills. Writing fit for publication and a compelling/persuasive speaker.
- 4 – High communication skills.** Above average in both writing and speaking skills; or excellent in one but unsure on the other.
- 3 – Average communication skills.** Decent writing and/or speaking skills. Nothing significant stands out as particularly high or low communication skills.
- 2 – Low communication skills.** Writing or speaking difficult to follow; unpersuasive, error-prone, or subpar English skills.
- 1 – Exceptionally low communication skills.** Incoherent writing or speaking.

Confidence Level – Rate your own confidence in the scores you have just given. This has a longitudinal component and should reflect your confidence in your scores based on the intensity of the interaction, the number of interactions you've had in the past, and the amount of time you have known this individual. **Confidence Level is critically important because it determines which evaluation gets pulled from a person record when scores are being pulled into a list for emails, program invitations, or reporting purposes.** Please score responsibly.

- 5 – Several consistent firsthand interactions.** Exceptionally high confidence. Corroborating impressions across several months, programs, or staff evaluations. May include a person you worked closely with for 3+ months, a person you have corresponded with on several occasions, or a person who multiple staff have corresponded with on multiple occasions. You could not get any more confident in your scores and you are absolutely certain they accurately reflect the person.
- 4 – Multiple firsthand interactions.** High confidence. Corroborating impressions across multiple intensive programs or staff evaluations. You are mostly certain your scores accurately reflect the person but haven't had enough consistent interactions to be 100% confident.
- 3 – Strong firsthand interactions.** Confident. Strong, consistent impressions from several people or thorough in-person conversations. May include several thorough interactions at a summer seminar.
- 2 – Firsthand interaction.** Somewhat confident. Impression from one program or in-person exchange. May include an in-depth conversation at an event.
- 1 – Limited or secondhand interaction.** Low confidence. Evaluation extrapolated from applications, brief conversations, online interactions, or secondhand information.