GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
AGENDA FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 22, 2021
Electronic Meeting*, 3:00 – 4:15 p.m.

I.   Call to Order

II.   Approval of the Minutes: August 25, 2021/September 8, 2021

III. Opening Remarks – Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Chair
Rector Jimmy Hazel will address the Faculty Senate
Reception for Faculty Senators at the Mathy House today - 5:30-7:30 p.m.

IV.   Committee Reports
  A. Senate Standing Committees
  Executive Committee
  - Senate Coffee Chat (on Zoom) Friday, Sept. 24, 2021, 9:30 am
    https://gmu.zoom.us/j/91891864102?pwd=SHpOQ3kzb3FOVDZxRmhTRGxDMk1zdz09
  Academic Policies   Appendix A
  - Approval of Change to Catalog Policy A.P.5.2.4: Termination
    from the Concentration or Major
  Budget and Resources
  Faculty Matters
  Nominations
  - Elect Senate Representatives to Task Force on Reimagining Faculty Roles and
    Rewards
  Organization and Operations   Appendix B
  - Athletic Council Updated Charge

  B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

  Gift Acceptance Committee – Annual Report 2020-21   Link to report
  Effective Teaching Committee   Appendix C
  - Revisions to the Course Evaluation Form
  Master Plan Steering Committee   Appendix D

V.   New Business

VI.   Announcements
  Provost Ginsberg
  Sr. VP Kissal

VII. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty

VIII.   Adjournment

ELECTRONIC MEETING

Time: Sept. 22, 2021, 03:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Primary Electronic Meeting Venue - Zoom:
For security purposes -- all attendees *MUST* login using any valid zoom account to join the meeting.

IMPORTANT: Faculty Senators must login using their GMU login/password from https://gmu.zoom.us/ to be recognized.

Join Zoom Meeting: https://gmu.zoom.us/j/93919773155?pwd=Wll1SUNBY2E5cFA1QWwxcC9WbnY0QT09

In case of problems with joining the meeting, use the following information to join:
- Meeting ID: 939 1977 3155
- Passcode: 007244

Having Trouble Joining the Meeting with the link above?
All attendees must sign in into zoom before joining the meeting.
1. If using GMU Zoom Account (required for all Faculty Senators)
   a.   Go to https://gmu.zoom.us
   b.   Click on [Sign into Your Account]
   c.   Use GMU login credentials to login. (May require 2FA authentication)
   d.   Once logged in – click on "JOIN A MEETING"
   e.   Enter the Meeting ID (see highlighted above) and click JOIN
   f.   If asked for Passcode: enter the Passcode (highlighted above)

2. Joining Senate Meeting using an account other than GMU Zoom Account
   a.   Go to https://zoom.us
   b.   Click on [SIGN IN]
   c.   Use credentials for your existing zoom account
   d.   Once logged in – click on "JOIN A MEETING"
   e.   Enter the Meeting ID (see highlighted above) and click JOIN
   f.   If asked for Passcode: enter the Passcode (highlighted above)

Appendix A
Academic Policies Committee

Approval of change to catalog policy

The current policy concerns only termination from the major. However, the local academic unit may choose to terminate a student from a concentration within the major and not from the entire major field.

Proposed changes to the policy are shown in strikeout (deleted) or underlined (insertion) font.

AP.5.2.4 Termination from the <u>Concentration or</u> Major

Undergraduate students in any retention category may be reviewed for possible termination by their dean according to the published policy approved by the major program. ~~Termination from a major—or from all majors in a college—~~ <u>Termination from a concentration, a major, or from all majors in a college</u> may be imposed as a result of excessive repeating of required courses without achieving the minimum standard, and for other evidence of continued failure to make adequate progress toward completion of the <u>concentration or</u> major. Students must be ~~informed~~ <u>notified</u> a semester in advance <u>of their possible termination</u> and given a chance to meet the standard or <u>to</u> appeal according to published college<u>/school</u> procedures. Once a termination decision has been made, a letter of termination is sent to the student by the dean and notification of termination from the <u>concentration or</u> major is affixed to the student's academic record. Students who are terminated are no longer eligible to pursue that <u>concentration or</u> major, but may declare a different concentration or major within the university to complete their undergraduate degree.

Background

AP.4.2.1 Definitions of Degree Components

• **Degree program, major, or field**: A program of study that normally requires at least 30 credits of coursework in the specified field. The primary program name (degree and major or field) appears on the diploma for bachelor's and master's degrees. Only the degree name appears for doctoral degrees. An undergraduate who desires to graduate with a BA or BS degree in two or more subjects must meet departmental requirements for the major in each field. For each major, at least 18 credits used to fulfill its requirements must be applied only to that major, i.e., cannot be used to fulfill the requirements of a concentration, minor, undergraduate certificate, or another major.

• **Concentration**: A second-order component of a degree program. A concentration consists of at least 12 hours that are not applied to any other concentration. Undergraduate concentrations are approved by the Undergraduate Council at the undergraduate level or by the Graduate Council at the graduate level.

Appendix B
Organization and Operations

Updated Charge for the Athletic Council

Current charge:

To act in an advisory capacity to the Vice President for Student Affairs in all matters pertaining to intercollegiate and intramural athletics.

Change to:

To act in an advisory capacity to the President in all matters pertaining to Intercollegiate athletics. The Council provides general review of the policies and operations of the University's athletic program with primary focus on academic integrity and student-athletes well-being. The Council provides the opportunity to involve faculty, administration, students, and other concerned groups of the University. The Council assists with educating the university community about intercollegiate athletics.

This has previously been approved by the Athletic Council.

Appendix C
Revisions to the Course Evaluation Form
Recommendations by the Effective Teaching Committee – Feb. 21, 2019

As part of its charge as a university standing committee, the Effective Teaching Committee has prepared a revised Course Evaluation form for consideration by the Faculty Senate. The current Course Evaluation Form has not undergone any sort of significant revision since 2006. The revised form is the result of work conducted between 2014 and 2019 by eighteen faculty representing thirteen schools and programs from seven of the university's ten schools or colleges. The Committee's work has been informed by research into elements of effective teaching, as well as the purposes for which the form has been used. The Committee has revised the form to make it research-based, more useful to faculty for improving teaching, and more fair when used for the purposes of faculty evaluation (in support of Mason's Strategic Goal #9, Metric #4).

We followed a rigorous development process, including (1) identifying elements of effective teaching; (2) revising course items; (3) obtaining feedback on the items from both faculty and students; (4) pilot testing the items; and (5) analyzing the results. We chose to undertake this development process for two reasons: (1) to ensure that the inferences made about teaching and the subsequent decisions based on those inferences are valid and can be supported by an instrument that adheres to measurement development principles, and (2) to protect all parties involved in a high-stakes evaluation process.

We developed new items based on a review of the literature on the uses of university student evaluations of teaching (SETs) for faculty evaluation with specific goals of increasing the validity and reliability of results. We also obtained faculty, administrator, and student input on indicators of effective teaching that matter to each group. We obtained feedback from all interested stakeholders by (1) conducting online surveys of students, program chairs, and instructional faculty; (2) holding focus groups with students and faculty from across the university; and (3) meeting with Program Chairs, Associate Provosts, the Provost, a college Dean, the Office of Digital Learning, the Faculty Senate Chair, the Faculty Senate, representatives of the Stearns Center for Teaching & Learning, and with the Director and staff of the Office for Institutional Research & Effectiveness (OIRE).

We reviewed a variety of sources on teaching effectiveness and identified eighteen potential categories that we ultimately collapsed into five. We identified categories of effective teaching by reviewing the criteria for teaching excellence set forth by the Center for Teaching and Faculty Excellence, criteria for genuine excellence in teaching set by the Provost's Office, and item databases used by other universities. The categories that were ultimately included in the revised Course Evaluation Form are: (1) student information, (2) student participation (3) learning outcomes, (4) course environment and experiences, and (5) instructor preparation and course organization. Some items may fall into overlapping categories, which suggests a need for further piloting. With additional trials and analysis, items should more clearly fall into distinct categories. We also added several open-ended responses as requested by faculty, as well as sample optional questions on the use of technology by the course instructor. We encourage faculty to customize the form by adding items of their own choosing.

We included student information items on class level (e.g., freshman vs. doctoral student), whether or not the course is required, the delivery format, self-reported information on absences from class, hours the student spent preparing for class, and expected final grade in the course. We included these self-reported items because the research shows that student ratings of faculty, as well as online response rates, can be highly correlated with some or all of these student and course characteristics

We removed two items from the current form, Items 15 & 16, which ask for overall ratings of the teaching and of the course, respectively. These items, which in many schools and colleges across the university have become the only items out of the current twenty-three that are considered in decisions regarding teaching

effectiveness for the purposes of annual evaluation, contract renewal, tenure, and promotion, were removed for several reasons. First, research on using these types of items suggests that they do not result in objective measures of teaching effectiveness and may lend themselves to gender and racial bias, as well as to bias based on grade expectations. Students may assign lower ratings to females and instructors of color and when they anticipate getting a final grade with which they do not agree. Grading leniency often leads to favorable ratings but may not lead to successful student performance in follow-on courses. Part-time instructors are particularly vulnerable to grade inflation due to the high-stakes nature of the evaluation forms. In addition, these items tend to be influenced by student satisfaction with an instructor without regard to any particular aspect of instruction, making the items susceptible to a variety of biases. Finally, these items offer no useful information to instructors for improving their teaching. By removing the bias inherent in using an overall rating for high-stakes evaluation, Mason can improve the accuracy and fairness of faculty evaluations and improve retention of minority and female faculty (in support of Mason's Strategic Goal #8, Metric #1).

In May 2018, we pilot-tested a revised Course Evaluation Form in twenty-five online courses with almost 400 students in eight colleges or schools. Face-to-face courses were not included in the pilot-testing per direction of the Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness (OIRE). Based on the results of the pilot test, we removed items determined to be redundant or unclear and reduced the number of items on the form to twenty Likert scale items (three less than the current form). An exploratory factor analysis on the items indicated a single factor (except for Items 7 & 8 on student participation), which we take as evidence of the construct validity of the revised form.

In preparing to use the new form, course instructors should be informed that a new Course Evaluation Form has been designed with its primary focus being to measure aspects of teaching effectiveness. The proposed form has been revised over four years of research and development, with a specific focus on stakeholder relevance (e.g., Mason faculty, deans/directors, and students). Following this Committee's recommendations regarding how the form should be used, the University will ensure that the form serves primarily as a tool for improving teaching, with a secondary goal being accountability as one of multiple measures used for evaluation.

Since the new Course Evaluation Form is a departure from the current form, we suggest a university-wide discussion on the purposes for using the form, in light of research on its limitations and lack of reliability for summative purposes. Under no condition should the results of the Course Evaluation Form be used as a single indicator of teaching effectiveness. In every case where teaching is being evaluated, multiple measures should be used. This Committee has prepared a robust set of policy recommendations for faculty evaluation, including the use of this or any course evaluation form, which will be released as a separate document.

The Committee's main recommendation is for the University to move forward with additional pilot testing of the revised form in a variety of course formats – online, face-to-face, and hybrid courses – with a stratified random sample of students representing each school or college in the University. Each pilot test would result in analysis and further revisions to the form to increase its usefulness and accuracy.

We submit this new Course Evaluation Form to the Faculty Senate for discussion and consideration with the hopes that you will recommend it to the Provost's Office for further pilot testing, and that the Provost moves to accept it as a faculty-generated tool for improving teaching effectiveness.

George Mason University
Course Evaluation Form

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

Student Information

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

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

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A or Unknown
Student Participation						
7) I completed all assigned tasks before each class.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
8) I consistently contributed to class activities/discussions.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
Learning Outcomes						
9) I gained an understanding of the main concepts in this course.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
10) I learned through the variety of learning opportunities (e.g. assignments, projects, papers, discussions, group work, peer review, exams) provided.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
11) I found the instructor's feedback helpful for learning.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
12) I learned due to the instructor's teaching methods/style.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
Course Environment/Experiences						
13) The instructor created an environment that facilitated my engagement with course content.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
14) The instructor encouraged expression of diverse perspectives.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
15) The instructor offered opportunities for students to provide feedback on the course.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
16) The instructor offered opportunities to meet outside of class time, such as virtual or in-person office hours.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
17) The instructor used technologies and/or resources/tools that increased my engagement with	①	②	③	④	⑤	○

Page 9 of 15

course content.

Instructor Preparation and Course Organization						
18) The course organization supported my learning.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
19) The instructor clearly communicated course requirements to students.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
20) The instructor clearly presented the course content.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○

Please respond to the following questions

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

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

-
-
-

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

-
-
-

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

Thank you for your feedback!

Page 10 of 15

SAMPLE ITEMS FACULTY MAY CHOOSE TO ADD

Technology Use

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

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

Revised February 21, 2019

Page 11 of 15

Appendix D
Faculty Senate Members of Master Plan Steering Committee Report, September 14, 2021

Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Zachary Schrag, David Wong

The Faculty Senate members of the Master Plan Steering Committee offer the following report on the Master Plan process.

Phase 1

Phase 1 of the Master Plan process ended in April 2021 with the release of the Master Plan Phase One Progress Report, available at University Master Plan | Construction at Mason

As that report explains, the goal of Phase 1 was "to collect and analyze relevant data, both hard and soft, so as to provide the university with an accurate accounting of the state of the institution from a physical planning perspective. The broader strategic goal is to establish a data-informed programmatic identity for each of the three primary campuses so that the more detailed physical planning work of Phase Two is purposefully guided by a larger vision."

The Faculty Senate members' comments on the draft of that report were included with the April 28, 2021 agenda and can be read at https://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/2021-04-21%20Faculty%20Senate%20representatives%20draft%20comments%20on%20Master%20Plan%20phase%20one%20report.pdf

Our concerns about transportation and workspace issues are being addressed in Phase 2 of process. Other questions have yet to be addressed.

A summary of our concerns about the Phase 1 report can be found at the end of this document.

Phase 2

Phase 2 began in April 2021 and is planned to be completed in fall 2021. According to the Master Plan website, it is designed to "focus on more detailed planning for the highest value scenarios, including: Mobility, Infrastructure, Sustainability, Potential new buildings, Renovations, Open spaces, and Other, as identified in Phase One."

The Faculty Senate representatives identified two areas of particular concern to faculty: mobility and workspace design.

Mobility

On September 3, 2021, we sent a list of questions about the transportation proposals that we hope will be answered as part of the Phase Two report. We append those questions here.

Three of the boldest ideas emerging from Phase Two of the master planning process concern mobility:

- Shift a great deal of Fairfax parking to a remote lot West Campus, connected by shuttle to the academic core
- Reshape Patriot Circle into separate north-south and east-west streets
- Develop the campus's stream corridors into a linear park with some kind of path.

All of these ideas have great potential to serve the university's goals of sustainability, well-being, campus life, and fiscal responsibility. They also could beautify the campus and make it a thriving place to live and work. But they also bring risks, if they make travel to campus so inconvenient that employees and students avoid it, or if they fail to provide the through routes for active transportation that would meet plan goals.

We pose the following questions in hopes of clarifying the planners' intentions and better understanding how they seek to achieve their goals.

<u>What are the goals and criteria of a mobility plan for the Mason campuses?</u>

We can imagine several possible goals for a mobility plan, based on previous Mason statements and Greg's explanations so far. We would like to see an explicit statement of the goals for a transportation system. How should the university prioritize or weight the following?

- Maintain the ability for students, staff, and faculty to get to their classrooms and workspaces in a reasonable amount of time after their arrival on campus.

- Increase land available for non-parking functions, including academic buildings, student life, residences, dining and shopping.

- Reduce the fiscal burden of parking and Mason's carbon footprint by avoiding expensive, concrete decks

- Meet sustainability goals by encouraging travel by means other than single-occupant automobiles.

- Accommodate multiple modes of transportation while reducing conflict among them.

- Contribute to the well-being of students, staff, and faculty by providing options for active transportation.

How can we encourage alternative transportation choices without denying access to campus?

The toughest tension in the above goals may be the wish to reduce the use of single-occupant automobiles without making access to campus prohibitively difficult to those who do not have other good choices. To resolve this tension, we might seek to encourage people who live closer to campus to use other methods, while expecting those who already have long commutes or tight schedules to continue driving alone. Can a mix of incentives, fees, and built infrastructure differentiate between those whom we want to discourage from driving, and those whose driving the university accepts as necessary?

What was the pre-pandemic status quo?

The Phase One report stated that "In general, parking is not perceived as a major challenge for the [Fairfax] campus." As the Faculty Senate members stated in our Phase One comments, this does not accord with what we've heard from students and adjunct faculty, many of whom arrive at campus later in the day, when the garages and lots are full or nearly so.

By contrast, full-time faculty and staff are more likely to arrive in the morning and have the option to pay for lots and decks reserved for faculty and staff. They can, if they were willing to pay, often find parking that is less than a ten-minute walk to their offices.

What data does Mason have about the time it took—before the pandemic—for students, faculty and staff, and visitors to find a parking space and then get to their destinations on campus? What proportion of university members used alternative means to come to campus? What proportion could have used alternatives?

What is an acceptable time to destination?

Remote parking, such as that proposed for West Campus, can be time consuming. For example, UNC Greensboro advises students using its Park & Ride lot to budget up to 30 minutes from finding a parking spot to arriving at their classroom: "catch the next bus (10 minutes max), travel to the bus stop closest to your building (10 minutes max), and walk to your building (10 minutes max)." It suggests that "Once you develop a routine for the semester, less time will likely be sufficient," but it is not clear how a routine would shave time off of any of those intervals. And buses run less frequently in the evening.[i]

Would Mason students, staff, faculty, and visitors also need to budget 30 minutes to get from their car in a West Campus lot to their destination? Or could direct shuttle service along campus drive cut both the headways and the time on the shuttle to below the 10 minutes required by UNC Greensboro buses? Could graduate students and faculty—whose courses often run until 10pm—be guaranteed frequent shuttle service?

What other specific metrics would constitute a successful mobility plan?

Beyond time to destination, how else might we set specific metrics with which to design a plan now and assess its success in the future?

Parking economist Donald Shoup has suggested that the optimal level of parking-lot occupancy is about 85 percent: enough vehicles to show that the lot is meeting a demand, but with enough empty spots that drivers do not waste time cruising.[ii] Is this the right target for lots and garages at Mason? How does that compare to pre-pandemic levels of occupancy?

What are the costs of remote parking? What are the alternatives?

Presumably a remote-parking plan would rely on frequent shuttle service throughout the day. What is the cost of such service, in terms of vehicles, fuel, wages, and environmental pollution? How might these costs be mitigated by new technologies, such as the autonomous electric vehicles tested by Fairfax County?[iii] What would be the cost of building additional remote parking, in both dollars and loss of green space?

Are there other parking improvements to consider? For example, are there ways to increase efficiency in finding parking spots, perhaps similar to the parking counters and red/green lights indicating occupied/vacant parking spots in use in some area parking garages?

How could Mason provide alternatives to driving alone?

Mason already provides some incentives, in the form of cash payments, transit benefits, and reserved spaces, for students and employees who come to campus by bicycle, public transit, carpool, or vanpool. How have these incentives worked, and how might they be expanded? Could infrastructure changes, both on and off campus, improve the use of bicycle, scooter, and transit options?

Other universities have announced plans to promote alternative transportation. The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, seeks to recognize bicycling "as a fundamental component of how UNC-CH functions" and to coordinate campus plans with those of the surrounding city and state.[iv] The University of Texas plan states that "The University of Texas at Austin has both an opportunity and an imperative to become a great cycling campus."[v] The University of Colorado at Boulder "Strive[s] to maintain [its campus] as a primarily pedestrian zone while providing opportunities for bicycle and skateboard riders to get across campus without a lot of interaction with pedestrians."[vi]

Could Mason's Fairfax campus aim for comparable goals? How do current plans for Patriot Circle and the Necklace fit into a broader plan to promote active transportation? Are there other infrastructure elements (e.g., shower access and bike racks) that would also need to be incorporated?

How have other institutions addressed these challenges?

In his remarks to both the Master Plan Steering Committee and the engagement session, Greg Janks mentioned that other research universities—located in metropolitan areas—are relying more on remote parking, but he did not identify any. Which universities have succeeded with moving parking from the core to remote lots? Which have succeeded in promoting alternatives to single-occupant automobiles? How have they defined success—by the reduction in congestion, the availability of parking lots for other uses, by user satisfaction, or some other metric?

And to what degree are Mason's challenges unusual or unique, given its suburban location within a major metropolitan area?

Workspace

At the kind invitation of Facilities staff, we invited all members of the Faculty Senate and the Adjunct Faculty Committee to a meeting with staff and consultants concerning faculty workspaces.

On September 14, consultant Gregory Janks, other Dumont Janks staff, and university staff met with twenty-seven faculty members, including tenure-line, term, and adjunct faculty. Faculty expressed the importance of private offices for full-time faculty for teaching, research, and student advising. They emphasized that without welcoming offices, faculty would be less likely to come to campus to participate in campus events, and that departments would have trouble recruiting prospective faculty in competition with other universities. They cautioned against relying on faculty to be able to work from home, given that faculty have varied living conditions and family responsibilities. Many university activities rely on faculty's having offices, and we don't know how many would break without them.

Faculty did acknowledge the diversity of experience with office space. Some faculty use their offices rarely, and the need for an office does not always track one's rank or title. They note that while we can't expect every adjunct to have a private office, it is possible to provide space for adjuncts to work in private and to meet with students in private.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Dr. Janks noted, "I can assure you again the Master Plan is not going to come down one way or the other and say this is the only way things should be. It will definitely have to say that solutions need to be nuanced and based on the specific user groups, and then begin to describe the range of factors in play. Some of them you won't like, with some of these prioritization questions and some of these questions about 7% this, 40% this. I think those are reasonable things to put on the table, although I certainly accept that that there are different views on that. I also think we want to represent the

need for deep thought, the need to meet with students, the need for privacy, the FERPA issues, and then, and then, amongst other things, this issue that you put on this table of having function be the guide. Our role here is to really try to highlight as many of these issues as possible and not come up with a single solution."

Summary of Concerns about Phase One Report

Faculty Senate Concern	Phase One Report
The Need for a Statement of Principles	No principles articulated.
Stakeholder consultations	No report on feedback from town hall meetings, or report of attendance at meetings with units.
A "primarily graduate campus"	No explanation of how that would work, or examples of other universities that have adopted that model for a campus.
Location of a potential medical school	No explanation of why SciTech is the only location being considered for a medical school.
A research park at SciTech	No definition of a research park, and how that would be different from an innovation district. Unclear if the term "research park" is used as defined by the Association of University Research Parks.
Innovation Town Center	Unclear if success of Innovation Town Center depends on any particular number of students, faculty, and staff at SciTech.
"Continuing education" in computing	Report revised to state that "Continuing Education will maintain their primary location at Arlington, but will also maintain multiple locations based on existing operations, including provisions to expand into SciTech." Unclear how that affects the need for space at SciTech.
Academic VIII	No discussion of how master plan process will effect plans for Academic VIII
SciTech's effects on other campuses	No discussion of how relocation of programs from SciTech will affect other campuses.
Faculty workspaces	No explanation of why Dumont Janks is considering office sizes below what Mason planners have previously considered the minimum to meet ADA requirements, or how smaller offices might affect needs for additional common spaces. More discussion is continuing in Phase 2, including the September 14 meeting with faculty.
Transportation	Phase 1 final report retains the statement that "parking is not perceived as a major challenge for the campus," which seems at odds with Faculty Senate report and Town Hall comments. No discussion of barriers to bicycling. We expect more discussion of this in Phase 2.

Notes

[i] UNC Greensboro, "Park & Ride," | Parking Operations & Campus Access Management, accessed August 26, 2021, https://parking.uncg.edu/getting-around-campus/parknride/

[ii] Donald Shoup, "The Politics and Economics of Parking on Campus," in *The Implementation and Effectiveness of Transport Demand Management Measures: An International Perspective*, ed. Tom Rye and Stephen Ison (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008), https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2zk4v5k3, p. 137.

[iii] Fairfax County, "Autonomous Electric Shuttle Pilot Project | Transportation," accessed August 27, 2021, https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/transportation/autonomous-shuttle-pilot.

[iv] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, "2014 Bicycle Master Plan," Transportation and Parking, accessed August 27, 2021, https://move.unc.edu/bike/bicycle-master-plan/.

[v] University of Texas at Austin, "Campus Master Plan," Spring 2013

[vi] University of Colorado Boulder, "Report of the Master Plan Task Force on Transportation," 2010, https://www.colorado.edu/masterplan/sites/default/files/attached-files/transportation.pdf.