

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY  
AGENDA FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
DECEMBER 5, 2018  
Robinson Hall B113, 3:00 – 4:15 p.m.**

**I. Call to Order**

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

**III. Announcements**

Rector Davis  
Provost Wu

**IV. Committee Reports**

**A. Senate Standing Committees**

*Executive Committee*

*Academic Policies*

Summer Calendar 2019

[Attachment A](#)

*Budget and Resources*

FY 2018 College and School Revenues and Expenditures

*Faculty Matters*

*Nominations*

*Organization and Operations*

[Attachment B](#)

**B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives**

*Effective Teaching Committee*

Results of Pilot Evaluation Form, Lorraine Valdez-Pierce

[Attachment C](#)

*Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee*

Response to Internal Review Committee Report, Matt Karush

[Attachment D](#)

**V. New Business**

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

**VII. Adjournment**

## Attachment A

### Summer 2019 Calendar (updated 11/28/18)

	<b>Session 1</b> 12 weeks	<b>Session A</b> 5 weeks	<b>Session B</b> 8 weeks	<b>Session C</b> 5 weeks	<b>Session D</b> 10 weeks
First day of classes	Mon May 20	Mon May 20	Mon Jun 3	Mon Jun 24	Mon May 20
Last Day to Add	Tues May 28	Wed May 22	Thur Jun 6	Wed Jun 26	Fri May 24
Memorial Day (University closed)	Mon May 27				
Last Day to Drop	Tues June 18	Mon Jun 3	Thur Jun 20	Mon Jul 8	Thur Jun 13
Selective Withdrawal – undergraduate	Jun 19 – Jul 11	Jun 4 - Jun 11	Jun 21 – Jul 8	Jul 9– Jul 17	Jun 14 – Jul 8*
Independence Day (University closed)	Thur Jul 4				
Summer Recess (Classes do not meet)	Fri Jul 5				
Dissertation/Thesis Deadline	Fri Aug 3				
Last Day of Class	Wed Aug 7	Wed Jun 19	Tue Jul 23	Thu Jul 25	Wed Jul 24
Final Exams***	Aug 8-10	Jun 20-22	Jul 25-27	Jul 26-27**	Jul 25-27
Degree Conferral	Sat Aug 24				

\* Last day for Selective Withdrawal is July 4th but the university is closed both the 4th and 5th, so the deadline is Monday, July 8th.

\*\* Classes end on a Thursday due to the July 4-5 holiday. Therefore, final exams will be held on Friday and Saturday.

\*\*\* Saturday final exam days have been added to accommodate Saturday classes in Sessions 1, A, B and D.

## **Attachment B**

### **Background**

The current charge of the Minority and Diversity Issues Committee is as follows:

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.

During the 2017-2018 Academic Year, the Minority and Diversity Issues Committee concluded that this charge was not well-established. 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 have been endorsed by Julian Williams, Rose Pascarell, and Kim Eby. All of these administrators have agreed to partner with the committee as it moves forward pending the approval of the name and charge change.

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.

### **Motion**

Therefore, the committee moves that:

1. The name of this committee be changed to the Faculty Equity and Inclusion Committee (FEIC).
2. The charge of this committee be changed to the following:

Working with the Offices of the Provost, Faculty Affairs, and 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 under-represented faculty members.

## Attachment C

### *Effective Teaching Committee*

Faculty Senate Meeting – Dec. 5, 2018

## Summary Report

### May 2018 Pilot Testing of Revised Course Evaluation Form

#### I. Selection of Participants

- 22 instructors of online courses
  - Recommended by Program or Dept. Chairs
  - No negative impact on evaluation or salary decisions
- 25 courses
- 384 students

#### II. Administration

- Online courses only
- Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness (OIRE)

#### III. Results

- May 2018 – Piloted course evaluation form
- June 27 & Aug. 31, 2018 – OIRE provided analysis results
- Aug. 2018 - Distributed survey to participating faculty on usefulness
- Sept 2018 – OIRE responded to request for additional information
- Response rates
- Factor analysis & item correlations
- Faculty Survey results

#### IVI. Next Steps

- Draft policy recommendations for faculty evaluation
- Revise items, reduce number
- Examine reliability of Likert-scale vs. rating scale items
- Meet with new OIRE Director

## Attachment D

### Response of the Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee to the Provost's Recommendations for New Gift Acceptance Policy

November 27, 2018

On May 2, 2018, the Faculty Senate passed two motions introduced by the Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee (ICOIC) after an extensive inquiry into the University's gift acceptance policies. The first of these addressed the need for transparency by calling for all gift agreements to be published in a permanent online database for public review within 30 days of formal enactment. The second motion sought to increase faculty input over gift acceptance by adding two elected faculty representatives to the Gift Acceptance Committee (GAC) and charging those representatives with reporting to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate in the case of a gift accepted over their objections.

At the November 7 meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Provost presented the policy recommendations elaborated by the Internal Review Committee (IRC) tasked by the President with examining existing gift agreements. Although the Provost described these recommendations as in keeping with the spirit of the motions passed by the Senate, he acknowledged that they were not identical. He laid out a process whereby the Provost would present to the Board of Visitors on December 12 a set of specific policy recommendations based on the IRC's more general recommendations. The Faculty Senate would then be asked to provide input. In the interest of shared governance, we believe that it is important for the faculty to contribute to the policy-making process at an earlier stage. In particular, we believe that the ICOIC can offer an informed faculty perspective as the President, Provost and Vice-President for Advancement develop the policy recommendations they intend to bring to the BOV. We offer the following suggestions in this spirit.

In general, we support the IRC's policy recommendations, but we believe they should be strengthened as follows:

- 1) With regard to transparency, the IRC and the Provost have stated that any "associated conditions" connected to gifts (everything the University has committed to do) should be made public even in cases when the donor has been granted anonymity, and that the identity of *all* donors should be made known to the GAC, including its faculty representatives. We strongly support these measures. Additionally, the ICOIC believes that meaningful transparency requires that all gift agreements (including past agreements) be made public in a user-friendly searchable database. The database should include labeled agreements organized in a logical sequence. While we understand that, in the interest of expediency, a searchable database was not feasible for the initial release of agreements reviewed by the IRC, this should be the goal and will provide a consistent structure for the transparent communication of gift agreement terms moving forward.
- 2) We support the IRC's suggestion that the GAC review any agreement that deviates from a standard template (p39). However, we have concerns about the process recommended by the IRC, based as it is on the concept of "escalation conditions" that would trigger "additional review" of specific gift agreements. This concept implies that some entity other than the GAC would be entrusted to determine whether each gift agreement merits review. Such a process would not be transparent. Should it be necessary to make the

committee's workload manageable, limiting review to gifts above a certain size (as specified in the faculty senate's motion) would be preferable to a process that includes a secret initial vetting. To truly inspire trust in the new process, every significant gift agreement needs to be reviewed by the GAC (with the substantial faculty representation envisioned by the IRC).

3) By envisioning "additional review" of agreements that are escalated, the recommendations stop short of specifying what sorts of violations would be considered grounds for the rejection of a gift. A more effective policy would establish principles according to which agreements will be evaluated, rather than conditions that will trigger a review process. Adopting such principles would not impose a one-size-fits-all rubric on all gift agreements, since the GAC would still be charged with conducting a review in each case; it would merely define the principles that the University community agrees ought to be the basis of the GAC's work. If the new policy does not establish such principles, it risks being perceived, perhaps rightly, as an arbitrary process vulnerable to pressure from powerful stakeholders.

Respectfully submitted by the faculty members of the ICOIC:

Matt Karush

Chris Kennedy

Dave Kuebrich

Bethany Letiecq

Lance Liotta