

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY**  
**AGENDA FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**April 26, 2023**  
**3:00-4:15 p.m.**

Merten 1201 and [https://gmu.zoom.us/j/98623076155?pwd=R09TekVSbnlTYUZPK2pUSjJkdzZFdz09\\*](https://gmu.zoom.us/j/98623076155?pwd=R09TekVSbnlTYUZPK2pUSjJkdzZFdz09*)

- I. **Call to Order**
- II. **Approval of the Minutes:** April 12, 2023
- III. **Opening Remarks**
- IV. **Special Orders- Election of the Faculty Senate President 2023-2024**
- V. **Committee Reports**
  - A. **Senate Standing Committees**
    1. *Executive Committee*
    2. *Academic Policies*
    3. *Budget and Resources*
    4. *Faculty Matters*
    5. *Nominations*
    6. *Organization and Operations*
      1. [Revisions to the Mason Core Committee Charge](#)
      2. [Revisions to the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee Charge](#)
  - B. **Other Committees/Faculty Representatives**
    - i. Faculty Handbook Committee: [Proposed Changes to the Faculty Handbook](#)
    - ii. Effective Teaching Committee: [Resolution on Implemented Evaluative Modalities of Faculty Instruction](#)
    - iii. Annual reports for all committees are being posted on the [Faculty Senate website](#) as they are received
    - iv. Additional committee reports
      1. [Mason Core Committee](#)
- VI. **New Business**
- VII. **Announcements**
  - A. Provost Ginsberg
  - B. EVP Dickenson
  - C. Faculty Senate 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration to immediately follow this meeting
- VIII. **Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty**
- IX. **Adjournment**

\* Note: For security purposes, all attendees must login using any valid Zoom account to join the meeting. Having trouble joining the meeting with the link above?

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 ORGANIZATION AND OPERATIONS

### Revisions to the Mason Core Committee Charge

#### Mason Core Committee

(Charge as revised and approved by the Faculty Senate – April 1, 2009, composition of membership amended September 7, 2011. Revisions including new name: Mason Core Committee approved by the Faculty Senate Dec. 4, 2013. Revisions approved by the Faculty Senate February 3, 2021)

#### Charge

The Committee will work in cooperation with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education on all matters concerning the Mason Core (formerly general education).

For all foundation, exploration, and integration Mason Core requirements, the Committee will approve courses to fulfill these requirements.

(The) Committee will develop procedures for assessing, reviewing, and recertifying courses that carry a Mason Core attribute. Utilizing Mason Core assessment data, the committee will review and revise, as necessary, the overall structure and outcomes of the Mason Core. The Committee will review and approve procedures used to substitute or waive Mason Core requirements. The Committee will confer with the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Policies when changes to Mason Core requirements impact the entire university and/or would be a substantive change to the university catalog. The Committee will provide an annual report to the Faculty Senate. The report shall include a) The courses approved for inclusion in or removed from the Mason Core, and b) Changes in the criteria for the Mason Core. More frequent reports to the Faculty Senate might take place as adjustments to the Mason Core program may warrant.

**Composition:** The membership of the Committee comprises 14 voting members:

- A Eight faculty elected by the Faculty Senate for staggered three-year terms ensuring that at least 6 academic units are represented, at least one should be a senator;
- B. Four faculty appointed by the Provost;
- C. The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education;
- D. One student elected by the Student Senate.

Ex-officio members are invited to provide input into the work of the committee and consist of the following:

- A. The Mason Core Director
- B. A representative from the Stearns Center
- C. A representative from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning and
- D. One representative from the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Meetings: Meetings will be held monthly during the academic year.

### Mason Core Committee

(Charge as revised and approved by the Faculty Senate – April 1, 2009, composition of membership amended September 7, 2011. Revisions including new name: Mason Core Committee approved by the Faculty Senate Dec. 4, 2013. Revisions approved by the Faculty Senate February 3, 2021)

#### Charge

The Committee will work in cooperation with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education on all matters concerning the Mason Core (formerly general education).

For all foundation, exploration, and synthesis and/or capstone experience/integration Mason Core requirements, the Committee will approve courses to fulfill these requirements.

The Committee will develop procedures for assessing, reviewing, and recertifying courses that carry a Mason Core attribute. Utilizing Mason Core assessment data, the committee will review and revise, as necessary, the overall structure and outcomes of the Mason Core. The Committee will rreview and approve procedures used to substitute or waive Mason Core requirements. The Committee will confer with the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Policies when changes to Mason Core requirements impact the entire university and/or would be a substantive change to the university catalog. The Committee will provide an annual report to the Faculty Senate. The report shall include a) The courses approved for inclusion in or removed from the Mason Core, and b) Changes in the criteria for the Mason Core. More frequent reports to the Faculty Senate might take place as adjustments to the Mason Core program may warrant.

**Composition:** The membership of the Committee comprises 14 voting members:

A. Eight faculty elected by the Faculty Senate for staggered three-year terms ensuring that most (define? At least 6?) academic units are represented, one at least at least one should be a senator;

B. Four faculty appointed by the Provost;

C. The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education; ~~and~~

D. One student elected by the Student Senate.

Ex-officio members are invited to provide input into the work of the committee and customarily consist of the following:

~~A. The Mason Core Director-~~

~~A. B. \_\_\_\_\_ A representative from the Stearns Center (ex-officio);~~

~~B. C. \_\_\_\_\_ E. A representative from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning (ex-officio); and~~

~~D. F. One student elected by the Student Senate.~~

E. One representative from the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Meetings: Meetings will be held monthly during the academic year.

Commented [LWP1]: Incorporates WI courses as well as ENGH 302, which had not been explicitly stated before.

Commented [DE2]: I agree w/ the at least six option here

Commented [DE3]: at least one (? this is a bit weird, grammatically)

Commented [LWP4]: The student member has always been able to vote and should have been listed here.

Commented [LWP5]: Added because of the migration of WI course to MC. In actuality, someone from WAC has always attended.

## Revisions to the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee Charge

### Rationale:

The proposed changes are meant to reflect more accurately the role of the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee (WAC-C) at Mason, providing a clearer view of the committee's responsibilities and goals. A copy of the original charge with tracked changes is below, followed by the revised charge and original charge for reference.

After a year under consideration, these changes represent a collaboration thoroughly vetted by the committee. The proposed changes are timely and meant to clarify both WAC-C's role in assessment and as a resource to Mason faculty. Specifically, the new charge articulates the committee's focus on supporting faculty who teach with writing and commitment to WAC principles of advocacy for equitable practices and intentional integration of writing-enriched learning across disciplines. The new charge also reflects a change in the WAC-C's role regarding Writing Intensive (WI) course compliance, coordinating with and advising Mason Core on outcomes while continuing to support faculty teaching WI courses. The WAC Committee has been in regular conversation with the Mason Core regarding this shifting relationship with the WI.

### Writing Across the Curriculum Committee (Tracked Changes)

~~Composition: One elected representative from each of the academic units offering undergraduate degrees, the Director of the WAC Program who is an ex-officio member with no vote or possibility to chair the Committee.~~

~~Charge: To advise and collaborate with administrative and academic units to support faculty who teach with writing across all academic disciplines. Specifically, the WAC Committee (WAC-C): To advise and work closely with the University Coordinator on Writing Across the Curriculum on current and projected activities and events and to assist departments in the identification and definition of writing-intensive courses in their curricula. To:~~

- ~~A. Provides guidance related to writing courses and writing instruction for faculty, academic units, university leaders, other committees, and the full Senate;~~
- ~~B. Works with the Mason Core Committee on the overall structure and outcomes of general education writing, including Writing-intensive courses;~~
- ~~C. Collaborates with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning and other units on the assessment of writing and writing-enriched learning;~~
- ~~D. Identifies the needs of Mason's student writers and faculty who teach with writing;~~
- ~~E. Supports the intentional integration of writing and writing instruction into courses across the curriculum at Mason, including Writing-intensive courses;~~
- ~~F. Acknowledges and celebrates the accomplishments of Mason faculty who teach with writing in order to recognize best practices specific to their discipline;~~
- ~~G. Advocates for equitable practices and conditions that foster meaningful teaching and learning with writing across the curriculum.~~

~~A. Articulate and refine the requirements for the WI designated course designated to fulfill the WI requirement in every undergraduate degree across the university with the purpose of establishing homogeneous WI criteria;~~

~~B. Assist colleges, schools and institutes in the identification of existing or new courses that degree programs propose to meet the WI requirement in their curricula;~~

~~C. Review regularly the courses WI syllabi to determine compliance with the WI requirement; D. Suggest ways to meet the WI requirement to faculty teaching the WI designated courses; and E. Assist with activities and events related to writing across the curriculum.~~

~~**Composition:** The committee will be composed of at least six faculty representatives elected by the Faculty Senate (including one faculty senator), from at least five separate colleges/schools; elected representatives will serve staggered three-year terms. Elected representatives can serve a maximum of two consecutive three-year terms; subsequent non-consecutive terms are permitted. In addition, there will be at least one representative from each of the following areas: Writing Across the Curriculum, University Writing Center, Composition, INTO Mason, and Student Senate. Members from the University Libraries, Mason Core Committee, Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, and Graduate Education will serve in ex-officio capacities. One elected representative from each of the academic units offering undergraduate degrees, the Director of the WAC Program who is an ex-officio member with no vote or possibility to chair the Committee.~~

### Revised WAC Committee Charge (v\_03.30.23 FINAL)

**Charge:** To advise and collaborate with administrative and academic units to support faculty who teach with writing across all academic disciplines. Specifically, the WAC Committee (WAC-C):

- A. Provides guidance related to writing courses and writing instruction for faculty, academic units, university leaders, other committees, and the full Senate;
- B. Works with the Mason Core Committee on the overall structure and outcomes of general education writing, including Writing-intensive courses;
- C. Collaborates with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning and other units on the assessment of writing and writing-enriched learning;
- D. Identifies the needs of Mason's student writers and faculty who teach with writing;
- E. Supports the intentional integration of writing and writing instruction into courses across the curriculum at Mason, including Writing-intensive courses;
- F. Acknowledges and celebrates the accomplishments of Mason faculty who teach with writing in order to recognize best practices specific to their discipline;
- G. Advocates for equitable practices and conditions that foster meaningful teaching and learning with writing across the curriculum.

**Composition:** The committee will be composed of at least six faculty representatives elected by the Faculty Senate (including one faculty senator), from at least five separate colleges/schools; elected representatives will serve staggered three-year terms. Elected representatives can serve a maximum of two consecutive three-year terms; subsequent non-consecutive terms are permitted. In addition, there will be at least one representative from each of the following areas: Writing Across the Curriculum, University Writing Center, Composition, INTO Mason, and Student Senate. Members from the University Libraries, Mason Core Committee, Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, and Graduate Education will serve in ex-officio capacities.

### Current Charge - Writing Across the Curriculum Committee<sup>1</sup>

**Composition:** One elected representative from each of the academic units offering undergraduate degrees, the Director of the WAC Program who is an ex-officio member with no vote or possibility to chair the Committee.

**Charge:** To advise and work closely with the University Coordinator on Writing Across the Curriculum on current and projected activities and events and to assist departments in the identification and definition of writing-intensive courses in their curricula. To:

- A. Articulate and refine the requirements for the WI designated course designated to fulfill the WI requirement in every undergraduate degree across the university with the purpose of establishing homogeneous WI criteria;
- B. Assist colleges, schools and institutes in the identification of existing or new courses that degree programs propose to meet the WI requirement in their curricula;
- C. Review regularly the courses WI-syllabi to determine compliance with the WI requirement; D. Suggest ways to meet the WI requirement to faculty teaching the WI designated courses; and E. Assist with activities and events related to writing across the curriculum.

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://resources.gmu.edu/facstaff/senate/UNIVERSITY\\_STANDIING\\_COMMITTEE\\_CHARGES.pdf](https://resources.gmu.edu/facstaff/senate/UNIVERSITY_STANDIING_COMMITTEE_CHARGES.pdf)

**APPENDIX B  
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FACULTY HANDBOOK 2022/2023**

Current Faculty Handbook 2022	Proposed Revisions
<p><b>2.10.7 Outside Professional Activities and/or Financial Interests</b></p> <p>The University encourages faculty members to keep abreast of developments in their disciplines and to gain practical experience in their fields. In many instances, consulting work affords excellent opportunities for faculty to improve themselves professionally and to bring added prestige to them and to the University. The University looks favorably on appropriate consulting work by faculty members insofar as it does not interfere with full, proper, and effective performance of faculty duties and responsibilities.</p> <p>Outside employment and paid consulting cannot exceed the equivalent of one day per work week without written authorization from the collegiate Dean. Faculty may be required to document outside employment to insure compliance with these requirements. Although faculty members are state employees, they consult as private individuals, and the University is not responsible for their work outside the University. When consulting, faculty members should take care to preserve the distinction between projects undertaken through individual initiatives and projects sponsored or officially sanctioned by the University. Outside business interests must not violate the Commonwealth's conflict of interests laws at <a href="https://www.mass.gov/info-details/conflict-of-interests-policy">https://www.mass.gov/info-details/conflict-of-interests-policy</a> or the University's <a href="#">Conflict of Interests policy 4001</a>.</p> <p>Faculty members may use university facilities, equipment, supplies or computer time in their consulting only after obtaining the approval of the collegiate Dean. Faculty must also secure approval of the collegiate Dean before using university resources to</p>	<p><b>2.10.7 Outside Professional Activities and/or Financial Interests</b></p> <p><del>The University encourages faculty members to keep abreast of developments in their disciplines and to gain practical experience in their fields. In many instances, consulting work affords excellent opportunities for faculty to improve themselves professionally and to bring added prestige to them and to the University. The University looks favorably on appropriate consulting work by faculty members insofar as it does not interfere with full, proper, and effective performance of faculty duties and responsibilities.</del></p> <p><del>Outside employment and paid consulting cannot exceed the equivalent of one day per work week without written authorization from the collegiate Dean. Faculty may be required to document outside employment to insure compliance with these requirements. Although faculty members are state employees, they consult as private individuals, and the University is not responsible for their work outside the University. When consulting, faculty members should take care to preserve the distinction between projects undertaken through individual initiatives and projects sponsored or officially sanctioned by the University. Outside business interests must not violate the Commonwealth's conflict of interests laws at <a href="https://www.mass.gov/info-details/conflict-of-interests-policy">https://www.mass.gov/info-details/conflict-of-interests-policy</a> or the University's <a href="#">Conflict of Interests policy 4001</a>.</del></p> <p><del>Faculty members may use university facilities, equipment, supplies or computer time in their consulting only after obtaining the approval of the collegiate Dean. Faculty must also secure approval of the collegiate Dean before using university resources to</del></p>



<p>support the activities of professional organizations.</p>	<p><del>support the activities of professional organizations.</del></p> <p>University Policy: 4021 Conflict of Commitment and University Policy 4001: Conflict of Interest govern faculty members' outside professional activities and financial interests.</p> <p>Faculty members anticipating engagement in outside professional activities, or with related financial interests, must review these policies and, where required, report and receive prior approval in advance.</p> <p>A faculty member's primary professional commitment is to their teaching, research, service, and administrative responsibilities at the university. outside professional activities that interfere with a faculty member's professional obligations to the University represent a conflict of commitment.</p> <p>A faculty member having a financial interest in a contract with Mason other than their employment contract, or a financial interest related to their sponsored research, represents a conflict of interest.</p>
--	--

Current Faculty Handbook 2022	Proposed Revisions
<p><b>2.2.5 University Professor</b>            From time to time the University will encounter opportunities to recognize current members of the faculty or appoint to its faculty women and men of great national or international reputation. The rank of University Professor is reserved for such eminent individuals. University Professors are appointed by the President and the Board of Visitors with the advice and consent of a standing committee appointed by the Provost.            University Professor appointments are normally reserved for full professors. The criteria for such appointments include substantial research or scholarship or arts credentials, as appropriate to the discipline.</p>	<p><b>2.2.5 Distinguished University Professor</b>            From time to time the University will encounter opportunities to recognize current members of the faculty or appoint to its faculty <del>women and men</del> <u>people</u> of great national or international reputation. The rank of <b>Distinguished</b> University Professor is reserved for such eminent individuals.  <b>Distinguished</b> University Professors are appointed by the President and the Board of Visitors with the advice and consent of a standing committee appointed by the Provost.  <b>Distinguished</b> University Professor appointments are normally reserved for full professors. The criteria for such appointments include substantial research or scholarship or arts credentials, as appropriate to the discipline.</p>

Current Faculty Handbook 2022	Proposed Revisions
<p><b>2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty</b>            All faculty are evaluated annually in their local academic units (LAU). The evaluation is based upon the contributions of the preceding academic year and, where applicable, the following summer. Normally, evaluations are completed by the LAU during the Fall semester.</p>	<p><b>2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty</b>            All faculty are evaluated annually in their local academic units (LAUs). The evaluation is based upon the contributions of the preceding <del>academic calendar year, and where applicable, the following summer</del> <u>academic calendar year, and where applicable, the following summer to include summer, if applicable.</u> Normally, <del>evaluations are completed by the LAU during the Fall semester.</del> <u>evaluations are completed by the LAU during the Spring-Fall semester.</u></p>

### 2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty

The bylaws or standing rules of each local academic unit (LAU) will include:

- The method by which faculty will be evaluated (e.g., by a faculty committee recommendation to the local unit administrator, or directly by the local unit administrator);
- The requirements for the evaluation materials submitted by faculty; and
- A statement of standards for overall “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory” annual performance. Satisfactory performance means performance that meets the standards of the unit. Unsatisfactory performance means performance that fails to meet the standards of the unit.

### 2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty

All LAUs are expected to review their applicable bylaws or standing rules on a regular basis. LAUs are also expected to communicate annually to the faculty in the LAU the bylaws or standing rules that pertain to faculty annual evaluations.

The bylaws or standing rules of each local academic unit (LAU) will include:

- The ~~method~~ **process, to include the timing,** by which faculty will be evaluated (e.g., by a faculty committee recommendation to the local unit administrator, or directly by the local unit administrator);
- **The criteria by which faculty will be evaluated;**
- The requirements for the evaluation materials submitted by faculty **to include a self-assessment;** and
- A statement of standards **or criteria that differentiates for at least three categories/levels of annual performance developed in consultation with the LAU faculty (e.g. “Exceeds Expectations,” “Satisfactory,” “Unsatisfactory”).** LAUs are expected to be able to distinguish annual performance that is “satisfactory” from annual performance that exceeds that standard. **One of these levels must be reserved for “unsatisfactory” performance. for overall “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory” annual performance. Satisfactory performance means performance that meets the standards of the unit. Unsatisfactory performance means performance that fails to meet the basic standards as defined by of the unit. An unsatisfactory performance evaluation, triggers the requirement to establish a Performance**

Development Plan by the LAU administrator and employee as described below. For tenured faculty members, a second unsatisfactory performance evaluation within four years triggers post-tenure review as described in Section 2.6.2.

### 2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty

The criteria for the annual faculty review are the same as those listed [Section 2.4](#). Faculty are evaluated on the quality of their performance over the entire scope of their contributions during the year and in the context of their goals, assignments, and other responsibilities. Performance expectations should recognize differences in faculty assignments within the same LAU. The local unit administrator has a specific responsibility to review annually the research and scholarly activities of tenure-track faculty and to discuss both the strengths and weaknesses with them on an individual basis. The local unit administrator also has the specific responsibility to advise term faculty individually regarding their progress toward achieving reappointment or promotion.

### 2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty

The criteria for the annual faculty review are the same as those listed [Section 2.4](#). Faculty are evaluated on the quality of their performance over the entire scope of their contributions during the year and in the context of their goals, **assigned workload, assignments,** and other responsibilities. Performance expectations should recognize differences in faculty assignments within the same LAU. The local unit administrator has a specific responsibility to **ensure the annual review includes annually all job components that are part of a faculty member's assigned workload during the evaluation period**. ~~the research and scholarly activities of tenure-track faculty and to discuss both the strengths and weaknesses with them on an individual basis.~~ The local unit administrator also has the specific responsibility to advise **term faculty on any type of contract** individually regarding their progress toward achieving reappointment, **renewal, tenure,** or promotion.

**2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty**

New language proposed to be added to the bottom of 2.6.1

**2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty**

**Annual Evaluations and the RPT Process Have Distinct Functions.**

~~Although~~ The Renewal, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) and faculty annual evaluations processes focus on the same general criteria (teaching; research, scholarship, creative activity; and service) and should, in general, be aligned; nevertheless, they have distinct functions.

Because faculty annual evaluations and RPT evaluations are distinct, it is important not to assume that faculty annual evaluation results will predict RPT outcomes at the level of an individual case.

**2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty**

The LAU administrator will meet within two weeks with any tenured or tenure-track faculty member who receives an overall unsatisfactory rating for the annual review. The purpose of the meeting is to establish a written Performance Development Plan (PDP) to restore the faculty member's overall performance to a satisfactory level according to the standards of the local academic unit.

**2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty**

The LAU administrator will meet within two weeks with any ~~tenured or tenure-track~~ faculty member who receives an overall unsatisfactory rating for the annual review. The purpose of the meeting is to establish a written Performance Development Plan (PDP) to restore the faculty member's overall performance to a satisfactory level according to the standards of the local academic unit.

<p><b>2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty</b></p> <p>The PDP should be finalized within 30 days of the faculty member receiving an unsatisfactory evaluation and no later than the end of the Fall semester. One copy of the PDP will be retained by the faculty member; one copy will be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file in the office of the LAU administrator; and one copy will be submitted to the Dean. The Provost will be notified by the Dean that the faculty member was given an unsatisfactory evaluation and that a PDP was developed. If the faculty member declines to participate in formulating a PDP, the LAU administrator will write one and give it to the faculty member and the Dean.</p> <p>If the faculty member has made inadequate progress on the PDP or has demonstrated additional unsatisfactory performance by the end of the summer following the unsatisfactory evaluation, this will be incorporated in the performance evaluation for the year. If progress has been achieved according to the provisions of the PDP, an unsatisfactory evaluation for the academic year cannot be given.</p>	<p><b>2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty</b></p> <p>The PDP should be finalized within 30 days of the faculty member receiving an unsatisfactory evaluation and no later than the end of the <del>Spring-Fall</del> semester. One copy of the PDP will be retained by the faculty member; one copy will be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file in the office of the LAU administrator; and one copy will be submitted to the Dean. The Provost will be notified by the Dean that the faculty member was given an unsatisfactory evaluation and that a PDP was developed. If the faculty member declines to participate in formulating a PDP, the LAU administrator will write one and give it to the faculty member and the Dean.</p> <p>If the faculty member has made inadequate progress on the PDP or has demonstrated additional unsatisfactory performance by the end of the <del>performance period</del> <del>summer</del> following the unsatisfactory evaluation, this will be incorporated in the performance evaluation for the year. If progress has been achieved according to the provisions of the PDP, an unsatisfactory evaluation for the academic year cannot be given.</p>
--	---

Current Faculty Handbook 2022	Proposed Revisions
<p><b>2.7.1 Procedures for Reappointment</b></p> <p>Term faculty on a single-year contract will be evaluated annually for reappointment by either the local unit administrator or a local academic unit faculty committee. Term faculty who are being considered for reappointment to a multi-year contract will be evaluated by a local academic unit faculty committee. Evaluation of a faculty member on a multi-year contract</p>	<p><b>2.7.1 Procedures for Reappointment</b></p> <p>Term faculty will be evaluated for reappointment <del>by either the local unit administrator or a local academic unit faculty committee. Term faculty who are being considered for reappointment to a multi-year contract will be evaluated by a local academic unit faculty committee. Evaluation of a faculty member on a multi-year contract occurs</del></p>



<p>occurs during the final year of the contract appointment. Both the method of evaluating faculty on single-year contracts, and the composition and procedures for the faculty evaluation committee, which must include term faculty, are to be specified in the LAU bylaws or standing rules.</p>	<p><del>during the final year of the contract appointment. Both the method of evaluating faculty on single-year contracts, and the composition and procedures for the faculty evaluation committee, which must include term faculty, are to be specified in the LAU following the procedures defined by the local academic unit bylaws or standing rules, which should be consistent with the procedures defined in the Faculty Handbook.</del></p>
<p>Term faculty on single-year appointments are evaluated according to the criteria in <a href="#">Section 2.4</a> and the procedures in <a href="#">Section 2.5</a>. Criteria for reappointment will focus on demonstrated performance in those areas designated in the initial and any subsequent contract letters. The local academic unit recommendation is sent to the Dean. Based on that recommendation and programmatic needs, the Dean will make the decision to reappoint, usually no later than 3 months prior to the last day of the initial contract, or usually no later than 5 months prior to the last day of the term of subsequent contracts.</p>	<p><del>Term faculty on single-year contracts will be evaluated annually and term faculty on multi-year contracts will be evaluated in the final year of their contract appointment.</del></p> <p>Term faculty on single-year appointments are evaluated according to the criteria in <a href="#">Section 2.4</a> and the procedures in <a href="#">Section 2.5</a>. Criteria for reappointment will focus on demonstrated performance in those areas designated in the initial and any subsequent contract letters. The local academic unit recommendation is sent to the Dean <del>(if applicable)</del>. Based on that recommendation and programmatic needs, the</p>
<p>Term faculty who are on or being recommended for multi-year reappointments are evaluated according to the criteria in <a href="#">Section 2.4</a> and the procedures in <a href="#">Section 2.5</a>. Criteria for reappointment will focus on demonstrated performance in those areas designated in the initial and any subsequent contract letters. The local academic unit recommendation is sent to the Dean. Based on that recommendation and programmatic needs, the Dean will make recommendations to the Provost whether to reappoint and contract length. A request to change from a multi-year to a single year contract must include a written justification for the change and must be approved by the Provost.</p>	<p>Dean will make the decision to reappoint, usually no later than 3 months prior to the last day of the initial contract, or usually no later than 5 months prior to the last day of the term of subsequent contracts.</p> <p>Term faculty who are on or being recommended for multi-year reappointments are evaluated according to the criteria in <a href="#">Section 2.4</a> and the procedures in <a href="#">Section 2.5</a>. Criteria for reappointment will focus on demonstrated performance in those areas designated in the initial and any subsequent contract letters. The local academic unit <del>administrator's</del> recommendation is sent to the Dean Based on that recommendation and programmatic needs, the Dean will make recommendations to the Provost whether to reappoint and contract length. <del>If the Dean's recommendation differs from that of the local academic unit administrator, then the Dean should submit a brief justification for a different decision. All multi-</del></p>

year -reappointments and must be approved by the Provost.

Any decision request to reappoint a term faculty member who was previously on a multi-year contract to a single-year contract must include a written justification for the change.

**APPENDIX C**  
**RESOLUTION ON IMPLEMENTED EVALUATIVE MODALITIES OF FACULTY INSTRUCTION**

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Effective Teaching Committee, George Mason University

TO: Mark Ginsberg, Provost, George Mason University

DATE: April 13, 2023

SUBJECT: Implemented Evaluative Modalities of Faculty Instruction

Introduction:

The evaluation of instruction within the institution is of paramount importance for an R1 University. As the University emerges from the pandemic into a new academic climate, now is the moment to ensure that instruction across the university is evaluated in an equitable, consistent, and professional manner. This evaluation is crucial to the reputation of an R1 university, as instruction has an impact on assignments, rewards, inclusivity, and diversity. Yet, many LAU's are struggling with evaluating faculty in a cogent way. Given the evolution in instructional modes, it is perhaps more necessary than ever that we are intentional about these evaluation efforts, both for annual evaluations and in RPT processes.

As a committee, we see multiple challenges related to the evaluation of instruction. For each, below we detail the challenge, relevant context, and provide a recommendation for addressing that challenge.

**Issue #1:** The university and LAUs do not have clear guidance about implementation of the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET), and the result is that response rates are dismal and the collection of valid/reliable data to inform instructors has been diminished.

**History/Context:** In the pre-pandemic context of paper SETs, there was clear University-wide guidance on how to administer the surveys. Response rates improved by the one-shot nature of administration and clear expectation to faculty that the surveys had to be administered. A separate set of online SETs were administered to courses that were 100% online (with differences in response rates). As of the Spring 2023 semester, there is widespread uncertainty regarding how to customize, implement, and utilize the results of the new, fully online SET. While OIEP and some colleges have outlined useful strategies, there has yet to be a determination or communication of a uniform set of procedures.

**Recommendation:** A clear, consistent, University-wide set of administration procedures should be provided to all LAUs outlining the process of customizing the SET, best practices for implementation of the SET, and how to utilize the resulting data in a holistic and formative manner. Response rate expectations should be standardized (and relaxed) so units do not pressure faculty to achieve unreasonable (in some cases, 100% is the college's goal) submission rates.

**Issue #2:** The University and LAUs do not have a standardized approach in the evaluation of instructors. Incorporation of peer evaluations in addition to student assessments of instruction and evaluation from a supervisor would greatly benefit assessment of instructors.

**History/Context:** In the past the evaluation of instruction was often based on data collected from the SETs, and specifically a particular question regarding the student's overall assessment of the class. This two-question focus, while easy to execute and consistent across LAU, was inherently flawed due to the

systemic biases associated with the earlier version of the SET. Even after improving the SET instrument, it does not provide a sufficient evaluative window to serve as the basis of an instructor's teaching or student learning outcomes.

**Recommendation:** Adoption of rigorous peer evaluations across the university, with a set of clear and consistent assessment procedures that reflect the university's mission, while providing the flexibility to allow LAUs to customize a portion of the assessment based on the specific goals of the unit. Workload guidelines should be clear as to how evaluation is to be accounted for within assigned instructional time so that it is not simply an addition to existing workloads.

A potentially useful example of an institution-wide peer review system can be found at Penn State, which mandates peer reviews of teaching RPT purposes and provides extensive guidance in their execution. (An example can be found [here](#).)

**Issue #3:** There are multiple alternative methods to evaluate instruction. Currently, these are either not used, or used on an ad hoc basis by various LAUs. These methods have the potential to deepen faculty understanding of their own teaching style and lead to improvements in the execution of their instruction.

**History/Context:** As the evaluation of instruction has been focused on the analysis of SET data, there has been no consistent effort to explore alternative methods of evaluation, nor has there been encouragement that the LAUs invest time/energy on this matter.

**Recommendation:** The University should promote the use of appropriate evaluation methods to supplement the data generated by the SET and peer evaluations. The set of methods utilized can be selected by the LAUs, and might vary across campus, based on what best fits with their specific needs. A particularly useful form of evaluation is a rigorous instructor self-evaluation process. Additional forms of evaluation that can be explored include structured group-interviews, teaching dossier/course portfolios.

**Issue #4:** Course evaluations should matter for instructors, but their recent function has not been consistent in purpose or usage.

**History/Context:** While many have reasonably criticized the pre-pandemic SET implementation structures and the evaluation items, the clear expectations *that* and *how* SETs would be administered provided not only for the collection of data to inform instruction, but also for the consideration of that data for developmental and evaluation purposes. While the data itself may have been problematic, all instructors at least had the common ground of data sets to which they could respond. Additionally, whether evaluations are formative, as well as their intended weighting in annual and promotion considerations, has been uneven.

**Recommendation:** Build a robust, reliable, and consistent context for each SET question.

In closing, we understand that good evaluation requires time, training, and intentionality. To identify effective teaching, we conclude that it is the obligation of the institution to ensure that faculty have their instruction evaluated through at least three of the following:

- Peer Evaluation

- Self-Evaluation
- Learning Outcome Metrics
- SETs within a structure of clear guidance and goals

Units which are not undertaking this level and breadth of evaluation should be charged with doing so in an expedient manner, which we believe to be no later than the 2024 annual evaluation. The Effective Teaching Committee is eager to collaborate with relevant University offices to provide LAUs the support in generating and refining the processes necessary.

### **Effective Teaching Review and Revision Resolution**

In parallel with our rise as an R1 institution, Mason has made an important commitment to teaching as noted by the development of the Stearns Center for Teaching and Learning, increased support for faculty development and more equitable evaluation of teaching throughout the University. We strive to continually support faculty and students in our pursuit of teaching excellence.

To improve identification of effective teaching and equitably support faculty in their teaching roles, we conclude that it is the obligation of the institution to provide support of the following evaluation metrics:

Required use of the online SET instrument:

- Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) should be conducted within a structure of clear guidance for faculty and students to establish habits that improve response rates.

Suggested metrics for all Local Administrative Units (LAUs) evaluating teaching:

- routine peer-evaluation of instructors of record
- instructor self-evaluation
- use of measured student learning outcome

To this end, we propose the following resolution:

**Each Local Administrative Unit that conducts teaching evaluations will report their current teaching evaluation procedures with proposed revisions to the Effective Teaching Committee (ETC) by December 15, 2023. The report will specifically consider approaches used for the standard online Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) and additional evaluation factors including: use of peer review; instructor of record self-evaluation; and metrics of student learning outcomes.**

One component of each LAU report will specifically address administration of the SET and plans for increasing student compliance. Evaluation plans will be reviewed by the ETC and representatives of the provost's office from the Stearns Center and the Office of Instructional Effectiveness and Planning. Reports will be returned to the LAUs with comments and suggestions during the Spring of 2024.

In support of the review process, a general rubric will be provided. Effective Teaching Committee members, the Stearns Center and OIEP will be available to provide support and consultation throughout the process.

**APPENDIX D  
COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Mason Core Committee**

Submitted by Debra Stroiney, March 6, 2023

March 2023 meeting

In Attendance:

Laura Poms –Mason Core Director, Deb Stroiney –Mason Core co-chair, Bethany Usher, Abena Aidoo, Lauren Cattaneo, Jason Kinser, Liz White, Shun Ye, Courtney Wooten, Shelley Reid (ex officio), Gina Polychronopoulos (ex officio), Nishok Chitvel (student rep), Krista Shires (recording secretary), Tricia Wilson (recording secretary)

Guests: Liz Bartles, Tom Polk, Laina Lockett, Jesse Guessford, John Cantiello, Kim Redelsheimer, Wayne Adams

Approved courses:

- MUSI 489 – Music Technology Capstone

Other Business:

- Faculty senate approved the revisions to the Capstone/Synthesis Category
- Edits to the committee charge were voted on and approved by the Mason Core committee to be sent on to the faculty senate O & O committee for approval.