

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY**  
**AGENDA FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**MARCH 6, 2019**  
**Robinson Hall B113, 3:00 – 4:15 p.m.**

**I. Call to Order**

**II. Approval of the Minutes of February 6, 2019**

**III. Announcements**

Provost Wu

Online University Discussion – Monday, March 25, 2019, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m.  
(location TBD)

**IV. Committee Reports**

**A. Senate Standing Committees**

*Executive Committee*

*Academic Policies*

Approval of the Academic Calendar Fall 2019-Summer 2020

[Link](#)

*Budget and Resources*

*Faculty Matters*

*Nominations*

*Organization and Operations*

Apportionment of Senate Seats 2019-20

[Attachment A](#)

**B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives**

**V. New Business**

Gift Acceptance Policy Recommendations

[Attachment B](#)

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

**VII. Adjournment**

Attachment A

Allotment of Senate Seats 2019-20

<b>Faculty Senate Allotments</b>	<b>2018 FTE FullTime Faculty</b>	<b>2018 FTE Part Time Faculty</b>	<b>2018 FTE TOTAL</b>	<b>%of total Instructional Faculty</b>	<b>x 50 Seats</b>	<b>x 50 seats (weighted) 2019-2020</b>	<b>Previous Allocation 2018-2019</b>	<b>Change</b>
Antonin Scalia Law School	47	15.4	62.4	3.7%	1.83	2	2	0
College of Education and Human Development	129	60.8	189.8	11.1%	5.56	6	6	0
College of Health and Human Services	80	51.1	131.1	7.7%	3.84	4	4	0
College of Humanities and Social Sciences	363	92.2	455.2	26.7%	13.34	13	13	0
College of Science	211	26.8	237.8	13.9%	6.97	7	7	0
College of Visual and Performing Arts	80	41	121	7.1%	3.55	3	3	0
School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution	19	5.5	24.5	1.4%	0.72	1	1	0
School of Business	111	31.7	142.7	8.4%	4.18	4	4	0
Schar School of Policy and Government	70	17.8	87.8	5.1%	2.57	3	3	0
Volgenau School of Engineering	194	59.6	253.6	14.9%	7.43	7	7	0
			<b>1705.9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>

## [Attachment B](#)

### Gift Acceptance Policy Recommendations

#### **General Background**

In response to the University's release in April 2018 of multiple gift agreements (all but one of which had expired) that allowed for donor involvement in selection and/or evaluation of faculty, the University President convened a Gift Review Committee that included members of the Board of Visitors, members of the administration, faculty, students, and an outside entity to assist in the review. The committee released a report with recommendations on XXXX. In response, members of the President's Office, Provost's Office, Advancement and Alumni Relations, and University Counsel developed revisions to the University's Policy on gift acceptance (Policy 1123) that aimed to address these recommendations. A draft of this revised policy was released for comment and input in December 2018.

The Faculty Senate ad hoc Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee reviewed the draft revisions and submitted a report to Faculty Senate. In addition, the full Faculty Senate discussed this revised policy at its meeting in February 2019. Finally, members of the Executive Committee have had continued discussions with Senators and with the Provost.

#### **Specific Background**

A brief summary of key substantive elements of these discussions is below:

1. Article II Section 3.C.3, which outlines the composition of the Gift Acceptance Committee, was intentionally left blank, to allow for discussion of the optimal composition. Primary points of discussion focused on:
  - a. How many faculty should be included on the committee – currently, there is 1 faculty member on the committee. Primary considerations voiced were (1) having a large enough number to ensure adequate faculty input, (2) ensuring the committee was not so large as to make it overly difficult to schedule meetings, and (3) whether there should be attention paid to having representation across schools/ colleges. Proposed number of faculty members ranged from 3 to 6. A point was made that having 3 would potentially ensure that at least 1 faculty member could be present at any meeting that was called. Having up to 6 – or trying to have one from every college/school – was seen as ideal in some ways, but possibly too cumbersome.
  - b. How faculty should be selected – currently, the single faculty member is elected from the General Faculty by the Faculty Senate. One proposal included having some or all of the members be Faculty Senators – the Chair of Nominations noted difficulty in filling such positions already. One proposal included having at least one member of AAUP – some noted that there may be other groups that also feel deserving of membership, so

this might be difficult to implement and sustain. A proposal that arose in discussions after the FS meeting on February 3 was to have already elected representatives serve in this role – specifically, the faculty representatives to the Board of Visitors Development committee (who are already elected to represent the faculty in issues related to development and advancement), and the Faculty Senate Chair (who represents the faculty to the Board of Visitors itself, and is typically aware of interests and concerns of faculty).

2. Article II Section C.5.a, which specifies that gifts of \$500,000 or more would have to be reviewed by the Gift Acceptance Committee (GAC). Questions about this threshold were raised, wondering why the amount should not be lower, and wondering whether there could be some way of including multiple gifts from the same donor for the same purpose that added up to \$500,000 (to avoid donors providing separate gifts just under this amount). Discussion on this (and some discussion on other items in Section C.5) led to the importance of (a) operationalizing these conditions and (b) checking to ensure that gift agreements that should be referred to the GAC are appropriately referred. After the Feb 3 meeting, discussions with Senators, the Provost, and other members of the administration highlighted the importance of establishing some form of “audit” process to ensure that gift agreements are appropriately referred. In addition, it was noted that, if the university has MOUs on file for any gift that includes conditions (per Article II Section D.1), the Faculty Senate itself could decide to obtain and review all MOUs to determine whether gift agreements had been appropriately referred. It was noted that the MOUs would need to contain a clear indication of whether gift agreements were deemed to have met any of the specified conditions in Article II Section C.5 (e.g., through use of a checklist) and a clear indication of whether the gift agreement was reviewed by the GAC.
3. Article II Section C.6 (The determination of whether a gift must be reviewed by the Gift Acceptance Committee shall be at the discretion of the Vice President for University Advancement and Alumni Relations.) – this was seen as highly problematic by most faculty. Subsequent discussions with the Provost indicated a preference to make the review for “escalation conditions” (Section C.5) a simple, transparent, and streamlined process that would be able to be clerical in nature. This would, in part, be facilitated by the creation of a template (e.g., a gift transmittal form) that contains all pertinent gift information, including check boxes indicating if any escalation conditions are met. Thus, any gift that meets one or more escalation conditions would automatically be forwarded for review by the GAC. The Provost noted that (a) such a template has yet to be developed and (b) the template is part of the processes/practices that need to be developed for policy implementation, rather than elements of policy itself. With a new VP of Advancement joining the University in March, the Provost indicated that it would be appropriate to involve that VP in the creation of these implementation processes/practices.

With this background in mind, we propose the following motions related to the draft revision of University Policy 1123 on Gift Acceptance – each motion contains a reference to the background point above.

## **Motions**

In regard to the draft revision of University Policy 1123 on Gift Acceptance, the Faculty Senate makes the following recommendations:

1. [See background point #1] The composition of the Gift Acceptance Committee (Article II Section 3.C.3) should include: the two faculty representatives to the Board of Visitors Development Committee, and the Faculty Senate Chair (or a designee of the Faculty Senate Chair).
2. [See background points #2 and 3] The University establish a task force charged with developing processes and practices that will ensure proper implementation of University Policy 1123.
  - a. This task force should include the new VP of Advancement and 1-2 faculty members.
  - b. The charge for this committee should include, but not necessarily be limited to: (i) creation of a template gift agreement, (ii) development of processes/practices to ensure appropriate referral of all gift agreements that meet conditions in Article II Section C.5 to the Gift Acceptance Committee, and (iii) development of an “audit” process to check that gift agreements are being properly referred.
  - c. This task force should report on its progress to the Faculty Senate no later than the final meeting of Spring 2019. If the task force has not completed its work, the update should include a timeline for completion, and a proposed future FS meeting date to report on the completed work.
  - d. Any revisions of University Policy 1123 should not be considered complete and final until the work of this task force is complete, its work has been reported to the Faculty Senate, and the Faculty Senate has had the opportunity to make any additional recommendations regarding either the policy itself or the processes/practices associated with implementing the policy.
3. The Faculty Senate Organizations and Operations Committee should establish an ad hoc committee that will be in place from Spring 2020 – Fall 2021. This committee will be charged with reviewing MOUs from new gift agreements at least once in 2020 and at least once in 2021, to ensure that all policies, processes, and practices are working as intended.