

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY**  
**MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**March 29, 2023 (spillover meeting)**  
**Electronic Meeting, 3:00-4:15 p.m.**

Number of attendees: 105 ([List of names](#))

**I. Committee Reports**

- *Organization & Operations* (continued from last meeting)
  - Doug Eyman presents the draft [charge for the Standing Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards](#)
    - Turns the Task Force for Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards into a permanent university standing committee per vote from last semester.
    - Tried to make this as broad and inclusive as possible and to align with the recommendations of the task force report.
    - Questions
      - On Dec 7 we voted for language about tenure as a safeguard for academic freedom. Is this reflected here?
        - Lisa Billingham: Our error, this was not reflected here
        - Motion to send back to committee for a simple edit to add this language. – **Carries**
      - Concern that likely number of tenured faculty outweighs number of term faculty, may create an imbalance.
      - Request – could we continue to consider the entire document before sending it back to committee so we don't go back and forth and discuss piecemeal?
        - Motion was voted on and **approved by acclamation**
  - [Senate Allocation 2023-2024](#)
    - Note: rounding error on the document that was provided
    - Lisa can share calculations if requested – will send emails with clerk.
    - Reminder that we changed the charter to allow for a 52<sup>nd</sup> member to account for rounding – this is the second time we have had to make this adjustment.
    - Senate Clerk will be sending emails to Deans re next year's senators.
    - Questions
      - Can we change CHHS to the updated name, College of Public Health?
        - Yes.
      - Are INTO faculty represented here?
        - Yes, they are under "College UN."
    - MBP clarification—there will be one additional senator from the Schar School this year – please plan for this

- Additional feedback can be provided to Lisa Billingham and Charlotte Gill (O&O co-chairs) via email.

### *Other Committees/Faculty Representatives*

- [Mason Core Proposed Revisions](#) (2<sup>nd</sup> read and vote)
  - Reminder: proposing to combine synthesis and capstone classes into one concept, the Mason Apex, to better streamline the approval process from Mason Core as well as being more specific for our students.
    - Courses will need to be at the 400 level.
    - No major changes until catalog year 24-25 so there is time for approval process and programs that need to redefine their synthesis or capstone courses.
    - Not cutting any courses and departments aren't required to add a course – can add courses already in Mason Core.
  - Two questions came up in first reading that we would like to address:
    - We reviewed comparable universities and found no strong leaning toward calling the culminating experience a capstone.
    - Concern that graduate admissions may not understand what Mason Apex means on a transcript. Mason Apex is just the name of the category, the name and number of the actual course will show. The transcript does not currently say capstone or synthesis.
  - Motion to approve core revision to Mason Apex – from committee, no second.
    - No discussion
    - **Approved by acclamation**
- [Proposed Changes to the Faculty Handbook](#) (1<sup>st</sup> read) – presented by Solon Simmons
  - The Faculty Handbook committee meets regularly to review handbook changes and incorporate changes from other committees.
    - We do not have the authority to actually make the changes, we decide whether we want to send it forward to the BOV.
  - First proposed change is adding the conflict of commitment language. New section 2.10.7 – this was not previously covered. [later clarified – misspoke on this, there is existing language in 2.10.7 already.]
    - Questions
      - Is there a reason this needs to be in the handbook rather than just having the policy? There are still concerns among faculty about the potential ramifications of this policy.
        - I believe it is because it's related to personnel issues, although not sure – anyone else in meeting who can speak to this?
          - Elizabeth Woodley: There is already a bit in the FH about conflict of interest, so we wanted to treat conflict of commitment in the same way. Recognize

the concern that this will have deterrent effects, but we do plan to have flexibility and information built into the policy so that schools and colleges can further define what COC means for their school.

- Follow-up: That helps, but concerned that we are codifying it while the policy is still being developed and there is more flexibility for the policy to change. Is it premature to do it this year rather than next year?
  - EW: This is to bring us in line with important federal requirements for researchers.
    - I agree with this re the policy, but still not clear if it's necessary to put in the handbook.
- We also share these concerns in the law school – talking to the media, etc. is a key part of our roles. We don't see these as external activities. I am also not sure of the value of adding this to the handbook before the policy is finalized.
- Agree – doesn't make sense before the policy is finalized and approved.
  - EW: Part of the concern is that because there are references to similar issues in the handbook now, if we move forward with the policy there could be conflicting areas of the FH. So partly we've been stalling the policy until we see what is included in the FH.
- I know this is a first read but I agree that it seems too soon to move forward. It also says "a faculty member's primary professional commitment is to teaching, research, service, etc." – what if an adjunct faculty member has an outside job? The writing seems opaque.
  - EW: FH doesn't apply to adjunct faculty.
    - Still not comfortable moving forward with this as faculty may currently be engaged in activities.
- There is a whole set of language in 2.17 that talks about outside employment and business interest but there's nothing about the policy.
- Right now, the language is a mixture of the COC and COI policies. Does the COI section need to be cleaned up as well?
  - EW: Yes, there are other areas of the FH that need to be updated to reflect the new RAMP COI requirements.

- 2.2.5 Changing the title of University Professor to Distinguished University Professor. Although this is an internal title, the Provost notes this would be a new rank to aspire to.
  - Questions
    - Could we change the gendered language in this section (“women and men”) to “scholars”?
      - Yes
- 2.6.1 Annual review of faculty. Changing review process to preceding calendar year (including summer) instead of academic year and complete evaluations in spring instead of fall.
  - Questions
    - Was hoping this wouldn’t be changed. We operate on the academic year – our appointments and workloads are based on this. Appointments and other requirements cross calendar years. This doesn’t make sense.
    - Speaking on behalf of chairs and directors here – we are not in step with this and have raised these concerns before. We want to explain why we don’t support it and why the arguments we’ve heard in favor don’t apply. We also want to suggest a path forward.
      - We’ve heard it aligns better with the timing of the raises – we’re shifting it from 12 months to 7 months removed. Not really a big difference.
      - Argument that we have to work on it in summer – a lot of us do it in early fall, and there are moves to better involve term faculty, but they don’t have capacity while teaching a 4:4 load as well. We accept having to do some work in summer.
      - We’ve heard it better aligns with the AP/Classified staff timeline – this just means everyone’s doing a ton of extra work at the same time.
      - Not compelled by argument that other universities are doing it this way. Agree with argument that academic year aligns better with workload.
      - Possible path forward – remove references to timing and just say it must be done annually and leave it to the units to decide. If we don’t do that, ask the committee to disentangle this (and maybe 2.7.10) so we can vote on this separately and not have all the changes go down because of these more controversial issues.
        - Response: There is support in the committee for dividing these up for the second read.

- Continuing with changes to this section – updating to require LAUs to review bylaws and/or standing rules on a regular basis and communicate bylaws relating to annual evaluations annually.
  - Have a self-assessment as part of the process.
  - Allowing for a third category of review (at minimum) to distinguish faculty who would qualify for special merit raises. One of the levels has to be unsatisfactory and there needs to be a way to distinguish satisfactory performance from performance that exceeds that standard.
  - Provides for a performance development plan for an unsatisfactory rating and post-tenure review for tenured faculty members who get two unsatisfactories in four years.
  - Questions
    - Not really sure what self-assessment means – there are a variety of approaches in the FAA workgroup report. Would like to have a better sense of how we’re defining this before we include it in the faculty handbook.
      - Response from Kim Eby: Correct that it does mean different things and LAUs would be able to define what that means for them. May or may not be a reflection. Should be defined in LAU bylaws - Each college defines self-assessment differently, so leave the definition open.
        - That is helpful; the following bullet point specifically devolves responsibility to LAUs so I think it should be explicit here too.
    - Not sure self-assessment is the right word here – a report of activities is not a self-assessment.
      - KE: this is what we’re looking for – more reflecting on why you met the standard.
        - This isn’t clear here.
    - Do these expectations cover research, teaching, and service? Are all of these categories covered here?
      - Criteria are defined in a different section – a little disjointed here but still in the document.
    - Wondering if we could consider saying that the requirements for evaluation submitted by faculty may include a self-assessment or may include written materials submitted by the faculty, if the purpose here is to empower the faculty - making it clear that faculty have the ability to be involved in the assessment.
- Continuing in 2.6.1, ensuring faculty are evaluated on the work they are assigned, not only research (for research faculty) because it is most valued.
  - Tried to ensure this language was appropriate for tenure-line and non-tenured faculty.
  - Questions

- “Assigned workload” language implies an annual plan of work, which we moved away from. Also, workload is typically assigned by academic years which is another reason not to change to calendar year evaluation.
  - The FAA workgroup worked hard to ensure people would be evaluated for everything they do as part of their jobs – this isn’t the case for everyone here.
- New language in 2.6.1 – clarifying that annual evaluations and RPT process have different functions; sensitivity of instruments is different for each purpose.
  - There is potential confusion about getting good reviews each year and then not getting tenure or reappointed.
  - Questions
    - Is this language necessary? Annual evals are not required for RPT, you don’t have to submit them as part of the RPT dossier. Why might someone use the evaluation to argue in their favor in the tenure process?
      - Response: In industry one assumes that if you keep getting good reviews you get to stay on. We are a strange industry in which you get to year 6 and then external people say if you’re good enough to stay on or not. There’s an interesting question of why we don’t include annual evals in the RPT process, but this is to clarify that in our industry you don’t automatically get the job or promotion. This also protects the institution from accusations of discrimination.
        - Agree with the response – there are certain things you’re expected to achieve by tenure that aren’t necessarily part of annual workload – standards are different.
          - Kim Eby: agree with this – our goal is to manage faculty expectations. Our law school colleague on the committee was very helpful in thinking this through carefully too.
        - Agree as a veteran of the grievance committee – I have seen a number of these cases and I think this language will help reduce these cases and risk of getting sued.
        - MBP: Speaking outside of president role for a second, I think it is useful because other institutions (like the one I came from) do use annual evaluations in the RPT process and it is good to communicate our different expectations to new faculty who are coming from institutions like that.

- Continuing – performance development plan (PDP) will be available to all faculty, not just tenure/tenure track. PDP timing section is changed to align with the proposed change in timing of performance evaluations.
  - Questions
    - If there is a 30 day window to finalize this process, is it necessary to specify the semester?
- 2.7.1 procedures for reappointment: changes aim to put pressure on LAUs to create bylaws (and ensure bylaws are aligned with FH).
  - The reality is that term faculty are vulnerable at the end of their contract. This change adds language to require the Dean to provide a justification if their recommendation for reappointment differs from the LAUs.
  - Questions
    - Possible unintended consequences in the first part of this change.
      - Creates extra work as term faculty will need to be evaluated more frequently (year one and year two). This also puts a burden on term faculty who will be involved. It is meaningless to review them in the first year because we have to tell them by October if we're not going to renew. We will have very little time to review on. It's a good idea in theory but adds administrative burden on units – may solve a problem but creates a new one.
        - KE – the problem we were trying to solve was to get rid of the LAU faculty committee. This language meant that for every single reappointment a committee had to be formed that made work at every level. The idea was that units could just use the annual review process – if last three annual reviews were satisfactory, we could just use those and send to the dean and be done. But people felt it was too prescriptive to actually say annual review process here so trying to keep it more broad.
          - I maybe misread it – thought we were taking the process for multi-year contracts and using it for single year contracts too.
    - I think this is a good idea – have been tied up with this kind of work and had committees scrambling at the beginning of the academic year – this simplifies it.
    - Thank you, Kim, for the explanation – I didn't read it this way either but if this is the actual process it is a fantastic change. Could this process be made a bit clearer here? Sounds like people didn't get the point about backing off from LAU committees from the language here.
      - KE – this may be where the genre of FH writing differs from informational writing like that which comes from my office. FH tries to stay away from too much articulation and

justification. The idea is that we would update the guidance on the term faculty website.

- Suggest communicating this directly to LAUs.
  - Also want to ask that this is made clearer in the bylaws and/or something to send to LAUs. This is a huge issue and there are people who are considering not going up for another multiyear contract. Also, when will this change take place?
    - May 4 BOV meeting if we pass changes on April 26.
      - Will info be sent to LAUs to say that this is coming before people get too far into the reappointment process?
        - KE – talked to Provost and Dean’s Council last spring, have previewed with chairs and worked with FH committee on language. Now we just need the FH language to get this approved. It will require a template change in Interfolio.
        - Keith Renshaw – I can work on getting this info out via the chair’s council. LAUs should also think about having bylaws changes ready to go so that we don’t have to do this in the fall.
        - MBP: We have 2 more meetings this semester but because we changed the FH committee charge, we can’t vote on these changes until April 26 – need 5 weeks between reads per new charge.
- [BOV Committee on Finance and Land Use](#)
  - See report in Appendix: 5-7% potential raise in Fall is the key highlight.
- [Capital Planning Committee](#)

## II. New Business

- The Nominations Committee encourages all faculty to nominate themselves for BOV Committee representative positions – see the reminder that will be going out later today.
- The Faculty Evaluation of Administrators survey, administered by Gallup, will be coming in April. We are hoping for a high response rate.
- Christina Lehnertz, International Programs and Services
  - President Biden is ending COVID health emergency May 11 and we expect international student applications to go back to pre-pandemic levels. We will be



sending info to advisors to assist international students with fall registration.  
Email [clehnertz@gmu.edu](mailto:clehnertz@gmu.edu) with questions

### **III. Announcements**

- [COACHE workshop](#)
- [Office of DEI software launch: Guardian](#)

**IV. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty:** None.

**V. Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:17pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charlotte Gill, PhD  
Faculty Senate Secretary

**APPENDIX A**  
**SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES**

**Organization and Operations**

***University Standing Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards***  
***DRAFT LANGUAGE***

Start here:

The University Standing Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards is charged with ensuring that the processes and timelines proposed to achieve the five goals laid out in the Task Force on Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards final report of Fall 2022 are implemented. These goals include:

- *Creating transparent workload guidelines that are equitable and inclusive of all faculty appointment types.*
- *Redesigning RPT guidelines that represent more inclusive frameworks for all faculty work.*
- *Developing a strategy for implementing continuous contracts for full-time instructional and clinical faculty.*
- *Clarifying the relationship between the annual review criteria and the RPT criteria.*
- *Creating a robust culture of faculty cohesiveness through career development for all.*

The Committee shall report to the Faculty Senate on the progress toward these goals at least once each year and shall confer and collaborate with the appropriate committees and campus offices.

**Composition**

- Chair or designee of the Faculty Matters Committee (co-chair);
- Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Development (co-chair);
- Chair or designee of the Faculty Handbook Committee;
- Three tenure-line I/R faculty, elected by the Faculty Senate;
- Three term I/R faculty, elected by the Faculty Senate;
- One Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs (or similar role, appointed by Provost);
- One representative from Research Council (appointed by Provost); and
- Two Local Academic Head/Department Chairs (one elected by the Faculty Senate, one appointed by Provost)

The committee shall be co-chaired by the member from the Faculty Matters Committee, and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Development.

\*The overall composition of the committee MUST include representation from *at least* 6 different schools and colleges.

**Senate Allocation 2023-2024**

School/College	2022 FTE Fulltime Faculty	2022 FTE Part Time Faculty	2022 FTE Total	Calculation of threshold size*	Adjusted FTE	% of total Adjusted FTE	x 49 Seats remaining	Calculated Allocation 2023-2024	Previous Allocation 20221-2023	Change
Antonin Scalia Law School	40.00	23.06	63.06		63.06	3.41%	1.67	2	2	0
College of Educ & Human Development	132.00	59.15	191.15		191.15	10.35%	5.07	5	5	0
College of Health & Human Services	102.00	53.77	155.77		155.77	8.43%	4.13	4	4	0
College Humanities and Social Science	390.00	102.54	492.54		492.54	26.67%	13.07	13	13	0
College of Science	233.00	29.15	262.15		262.15	14.19%	6.95	7	7	0
College of Visual & Perf Arts	95.00	50.16	145.16		145.16	7.86%	3.85	4	4	0
Carter School	18.00	5.83	23.83					1	1	0
School of Business	118.00	26.84	144.84		144.84	7.84%	3.84	4	4	0
Schar School of Policy and Government	71.00	25.35	96.35		96.35	5.22%	2.56	3	2	1
College of Engineering & Computing	228.00	68.04	296.04		296.04	16.03%	7.85	8	8	0
College UN	24.00	0.33	24.33					1	1	0
			<b>1895.22</b>	<b>37.16</b>	<b>1847.06</b>		49.00	52	51	

**APPENDIX B  
MASON CORE PROPOSED REVISIONS**

**Mason Core Committee Proposal to Consolidate Capstone and Synthesis Requirements  
Finalized Version (3/15/23)**

**Current requirements (directly from 2022-2023 catalog):**

**Synthesis or Capstone Experience Requirement  
(minimum 3 credits)**

The purpose of the synthesis course is to provide students with the opportunity to synthesize the knowledge, skills and values gained from the Mason Core curriculum. Synthesis courses strive to expand students' ability to master new content, think critically, and develop life-long learning skills across the disciplines. While it is not feasible to design courses that cover "all" areas of general education, synthesis courses should function as a careful alignment of disciplinary goals with a range of Mason Core learning outcomes.

**Learning Outcomes for Synthesis:**

The Mason Core synthesis course must address outcomes 1 and 2, and at least one outcome under 3. Upon completing a synthesis course, students will be able to:

1. Communicate effectively in both oral and written forms, applying appropriate rhetorical standards (e.g., audience adaptation, language, argument, organization, evidence, etc.)
2. Using perspectives from two or more disciplines, connect issues in a given field to wider intellectual, community or societal concerns
3. Apply critical thinking skills to:
  - a. Evaluate the quality, credibility and limitations of an argument or a solution using appropriate evidence or resources, OR,
  - b. Judge the quality or value of an idea, work, or principle based on appropriate analytics and standards

**Required: One approved course.**

The purpose of the capstone course or sequence of courses is to provide a high impact, culminating element of an undergraduate education, helping students develop a more comprehensive and integrative understanding of their area of study and to utilize critical thinking skills. Capstone courses provide students opportunities to apply and demonstrate their knowledge and generally involve integrative /applied/ experiential projects. Student learning in a Capstone course is assessed using a set of identified learning outcomes, and for critical thinking, as defined by the American Association of Colleges & Universities.

**While each academic degree program defines its learning outcomes, a Capstone course or sequence should follow these guidelines:**

- Minimum of 3 credits
- Later in the curriculum, after a student has taken at least 85 credits, and at the 400 course level
- No more than 35 students in the course or equivalent instructional/ mentored support
- Emphasis on experiential/applied/integrative learning
- Allow students to apply critical thinking skills
- Learning outcomes defined by the degree program

**Required:** One approved upper-division course. Please speak with an advisor to determine the appropriate course to fulfill your major's requirement.

### **Proposed Revision: Mason Apex**

**Rationale:** The disparate categories of Capstone and Synthesis are quite confusing for faculty submitting courses and for students completing their degree requirements. The synthesis requirement has learning outcomes but no additional guidance for scaffolding a student's program of study while the capstone requirement has "rules" for courses, but no identified learning outcomes.

The revised category's requirements support both disciplinary (like Capstone) and interdisciplinary experiences (like Synthesis). Combining the two categories into an overarching category captures the intent of both Core categories, is much less confusing, is inclusive of all disciplines, and will consider a wider range of high impact experiences.

The category's name was suggested by Mason students, a number of whom participated in brainstorming sessions with Student Involvement staff and the Mason Core Director. The Mason Core Committee made the final decision.

**Summary:** Replace the separate categories of Capstone and Synthesis with a single inclusive category: Mason Apex.

**Implementation Timeline:**

Update effective for 2024-2025 catalog. Existing 400 level Capstone and Synthesis courses will transition to the new category. Existing 300-level courses will transition initially but will need to go through a renumbering process, if appropriate, that will be facilitated by the Mason Core Committee. Departments will not be required to create new courses or add a course to existing major requirements.

**Catalog Description**

Mason Apex courses or sequence of courses provide Mason students with a high-impact culminating experience, requiring students to utilize critical thinking skills and preparing them for life-long learning. Students are challenged to draw connections across their Mason undergraduate academic experience. Mason Apex courses provide students opportunities to apply and communicate their knowledge, and involve integrative, applied, or experiential projects.

**Required:** A minimum of 3 credits at the 400-level. Students enroll after completing at least 85 credits. These courses maintain faculty/instructor/mentor-to-student ratio of no more than 1:35.

**Learning Outcomes (both must be demonstrated)**

Upon completing a Mason Apex course, students will be able to:

1. Integrate skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained across a Mason student's undergraduate education to explore complex issues in original ways.
2. Communicate effectively the results of the student's work with awareness of audience, purpose, and context using an appropriate modality (for example: written, oral, visual, material, embodied, multimodal).

APPENDIX C  
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>No existing language</p>	<p><b>2.10.7 Outside Professional Activities and/or Financial Interests</b></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> <p>University Policy: 4021 Conflict of Commitment and <u>University Policy 4001: Conflict of Interest</u> govern faculty members’ Outside Professional Activities and Financial Interests. 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>

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 women and men 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 <b>calendar year, to include summer if applicable.</b> <del>academic year and, where applicable, the following summer.</del> Normally, evaluations are completed by the LAU during the <b>Spring</b> <del>Fall</del> semester.</p>



### 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.

### 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 **process** 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 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. ~~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 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 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. Term faculty on single-year contracts will be evaluated annually and term faculty on multi-year contracts will be</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><b>evaluated in the final year of their contract appointment</b></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>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 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 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>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. <b>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-year reappointments and must be approved by the Provost.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p>

**ARTICLE I.**

## APPENDIX D COMMITTEE REPORTS

### BOV Committee on Finance and Land Use

Report from Mohan Venigalla, Faculty Rep on the BOV Committee on Finance and Land Use.

The following are important takeaways from the Finance and Land Use committee meeting of the BOV on Feb 23, 2023.

- Mason is proposing a modest \$300 (flat and across the board) increase in tuition and fee for AY 24. This proposal is currently being vetted by the BOV and other stakeholders. It is expected to finalize at the May meeting of the BOV.
- Mason received an additional \$10.64 million from the Commonwealth for capital funding of different buildings under construction. This additional funding is primarily intended to cover cost escalation due to inflation.
- There is a **potential for 5 to 7%** merit increase of faculty and staff salaries (to be effective at the beginning of AY 24). Half of this increase is expected to come from the Commonwealth and the other half from Mason funds.

### Capital Planning Committee

Submitted by Samuel Frye

#### Small Capital Improvement Plan

Senior Leadership suspended the 2022 pilot program due to FY2023 budget uncertainties. The program may be reinstated at some time in the future pending funding availability.

#### Building Projects

The Commonwealth opted not to fund any of the new building projects. However, the House and Senate are currently negotiating an increase in deferred maintenance funding that will likely land in the range of \$895K to \$8M in additional funding.

Capital Strategy and Planning (CS&P) has secured funding for the previously approved Community Music, Recreation, and Well-Being Center which will provide recreational and competition spaces, teaching and office spaces, and multipurpose rooms. The project is presently in the procurement phase with Facilities to select the Design/Build contractor for implementation and is anticipated to be completed in Fall 2024.

#### Planning Studies

CS&P planning studies presently underway include:

- Engineering & Science Sector Study – Phased implementation strategy to attend to space deficiencies identified in the Master Plan for the College of Engineering and Computing and the College of Science.
- Mixed Use Market Feasibility Study - Supports campus edge development per the Master Plan.



## APPENDIX E ANNOUNCEMENTS

### COACHE workshop

Dear Colleagues:

During the spring of 2022, Mason faculty participated in the Harvard COACHE Faculty Satisfaction Survey. During the fall, we received a customized report that highlighted key findings as well as provided access to data files that offer a deeper understanding of faculty satisfaction. The COACHE Leadership Team also wrote an Executive Summary. Data can be examined to learn more about trends across colleges, faculty demographics, and faculty ranks.

The COACHE Leadership Team is hosting a three-hour workshop on March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2023 from 12-3 pm to introduce people to the data, provide hands-on experiences to analyze key topic areas, and guide people on how they might be able to use the data to support positive changes.

Please join us in the Main Reading Room of the Fenwick Library. This will be a fully in-person event. Please RSVP [here](#) to attend.

Best Wishes,  
Kim Eby and Supriya Baily  
Co-Chairs, COACHE Leadership Team

### Office of DEI Software Launch: Guardian

Greetings!

The Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion is excited to announce the launch of Guardian, a Campus Kaizen case management and reporting software. DEI has phased its launch of the software, and the ADA unit within DEI is the first to transition to the software, beginning Monday, March 20, 2023. Other units within DEI (Title IX and EO/Non-Discrimination) will transition to Guardian in summer 2023.

ADA Accommodations requests and Accessibility concerns can be submitted through Guardian, improving record keeping and reducing response times. The information will be sent directly to the Interim ADA Coordinator for review.

The DEI Office wanted to ensure that you and your department were aware of this change so that you can refer all campus community members who may come to you with a concern of access or a request that may qualify for accommodations. Beginning Monday, March 20, 2023, there will be links to the appropriate Guardian Report Form on our ADA Websites, linked below.

Accommodation Request: [Disability Accommodations | Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion](#)  
Accessibility Concern: [Accessibility | Diversity, Equity and Inclusion](#)

**Why use a case management and reporting software?**

Guardian is a tool capable of receiving reports and maintaining all case records necessary for compliance and quality customer service. The software will log and track all cases securely and confidentially. It also allows for further compliance with ADA and Title IX regulations regarding record keeping.

**What does this mean for me?**

Beginning March 20, 2023, all ADA Accommodations and Accessibility concerns can be submitted through Guardian utilizing a link located on the ADA tab of the DEI website. The updated links will ask similar questions as before, just in a different format.

**Is single sign on required?**

It will depend on the specific incident report. As ADA Accommodations and Accessibility concerns serve the needs of Mason students, employees and guests, the single sign on is not required. However, for other DEI areas it may be.

**What to do if I have questions?**

Any questions regarding ADA can be submitted to the Interim ADA Coordinator at [ADA@gmu.edu](mailto:ADA@gmu.edu).

Should you have any questions regarding Guardian, its features, or this transition please contact Hortense Rascoe at [hrascoe@gmu.edu](mailto:hrascoe@gmu.edu) or via the DEI email at [DEI@gmu.edu](mailto:DEI@gmu.edu).

Sincerely,

**Rachel Elliott**

**Interim ADA Coordinator**

Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

George Mason University

[rellio2@gmu.edu](mailto:rellio2@gmu.edu)

*Pronouns: she, her, they, them*

**March 29, 2023**  
**LIST OF ATTENDEES**

**102 Total Listed Attendees (40 Senators and 62 Visitors)**  
**3 Additional Visitors attended who chose not to be listed**

**40 Senators present:** Alan Abramson, Karen Akerlof, Alok Berry, Lisa Billingham, Virginia Blair, Michelle Boardman, Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Jamie Clark, Richard Craig, Tim Curby, Delton Daigle, Doug Eyman, Tim Gibson, Charlotte Gill, Victoria Grady, Liling Huang, Kerri LaCharite, Lisa Lister, Tamara Maddox, Alexandra Masterson, Kumar Mehta, Anna Pollack, Marvin Powell, Keith Renshaw, Greg Robinson, Pierre Rodgers, Esperanza Roman Mendoza, Catherine Sausville, Jessica Scarlata, Zachary Schrag, Gene Shuman, Solon Simmons, Cristiana Stan, Benjamin Steger, Kun Sun, Matthew Theeke, Mohan Venigalla, David Wong, Thomas Wood, Jie Zhang

**12 Senators absent:** Jatin Ambegeonkar, Dominique Banville, Meagan Call-Cummings, Daniel Garrison, Edward Gero, Bijan Jabbari, Eugene Kontorovich, Laurie Miller, Kathleen Roberts, Rebecca Sutter, Anne Verhoeven, Theresa Wills

**62 Visitors present:** Anu Aneja, Ann Ardis, Enock Belony, Heidi Blackburn, Lisa Breglia, Tom Butler, Kathleen Chang, Shannon Davis, Truman Deree, Deb Dickenson, Kim Eby, Cynthia Fuchs, Marcy Glover, Ingrid Guerra Lopez, Renate Guilford, Steven Harris-Scott, Ginny Hoy, Seth Hudson, Erin Iacangelo Rogers, Emily Ihara, Kimberly Jackson Davidson, Nancy Jenkins, Kristin Johnsen-Neshati, Devon Johnson, Toshia Johnson, Jason Kinser, Quyen Le, Christina Lehnertz, Tim Leslie, Jordan Locke, Laina Lockett, Stephanie Lowe, Dhafer Marzougui, Jennifer Meslener, Jessica Mitro, Janette Muir, Bobbi Nelson, Jneva Norfleet, Shernita Parker, Sarah Parnell, Melissa Perry, Cathy Pinskey, Gina Polychronopoulos, Laura Poms, Shelley Reid, Lauren Reuscher, Marguerite Rippey, ChangGyo Ryu, Michele Schwiertz, Pamela Shepherd, Diane Spence, Debra Stroiney, Cathy Tompkins, Amanda Torres, Bethany Usher, Laura Wheeler Poms, Liz White, Preston Williams, Tricia Wilson, Elizabeth Woodley, Courtney Wooten, Lori Yi