

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
DRAFT MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
MARCH 2, 2011
Robinson Hall B113, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

Senators Present: Ernest Barreto, Sheryl Beach, Jim Bennett, Doris Bitler, John Cantiello, Jose Cortina, Betsy DeMulder, Daniel Garrison, Lloyd Griffiths, Susan Hirsch, Mark Houck, Dan Joyce, David Kuebrich, Howard Kurtz, Linda Monson, Jean Moore, Janette Muir, Star Muir, Paula Petrik, Frank Philpot, Peter Pober, Earle Reybold, Pierre Rodgers, Jim Sanford, Suzanne Slayden, Ray Sommer, Thomas Speller, Peter Stearns, June Tangney, Eva Thorp, Susan Trencher, Nigel Waters, Phil Wiest, John Zenelis, Stanley Zoltek.

Senators Absent: Heibatollah Baghi, Alok Berry, Jack Censer, Vikas Chandhoke, Rick Coffinberger, Lloyd Cohen, Maggie Daniels, Nicole Darnall, Yvonne Demory, Robert Dudley, Kelly Dunne, Mark Ginsberg, Jack Goldstone, Jorge Haddock, Frances Harbour, Margret Hjalmarson, Dimitrios Ioannou, Alan Merten, Adam Mossoff, James Olds, Daniel Polsby, William Reeder, Edward Rhodes, Joe Scimecca, Suzanne Scott, Shirley Travis, Iosif Vaisman, Harry Wechsler.

Visitors Present: Rick Davis, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education; Pat Donini, Deputy Director/Employee Relations Director, Human Resources; Esther Elstun, Professor Emerita, Modern and Classical Languages; Dolores Gomez-Roman, University Ombudsman; Linda Harber, Associate Vice President, Human Resources and Payroll; Robin Herron, Associate Director, Office of Media and Public Relations; Reuben Jones, Academics Editor, Connect2Mason.com; Susan Jones, University Registrar; Leroy LaFleur, University Libraries; Della Patrick, Staff Senate Liaison; Claudia Rector, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs; Linda Schwartzstein, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs/Vice President, Enrollment Services; Joy Ewing Taylor, Director, Learning Support Services, DoIT, Rector Ernst Volgenau.

I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

II. Announcements

Chair Peter Pober welcomed Rector Ernst Volgenau, praising his exemplary leadership.

Rector Volgenau noted that the Board is preoccupied with raising money, we spend a good deal of time on this beyond the normal fiduciary responsibilities of Board of Trustees, along with formal approval of courses, tenure, operating budget. With all of this, we always reserve an amount of time to raise money through initiatives. (reference to serious shortfall) Initiative ideas include public-private partnerships, things to legitimately leverage name of university without demeaning it. The BOV continues to pursue more money for faculty and student aid. And noted that grants bring infrastructure funding. New Visitors have been appointed by the Governor for four year terms, with one term renewal possible, so there is flow-through of Visitors. The Rector opened the floor to questions.

Senator Question: The Faculty Senate posts salary data on its website. Faculty have not had raises in 3-4 years. There was a notation that the President was paid a contractual raise of \$64,000.

Rector Reponse: The contractual agreement with President Merten (in 2005 or 2006, with a two-year

extension ending in 2011) calls for a series of raises. I also remind you that President Merten gave up his bonus and pay raises (two years in a row) and donated them to the university.

Senator Question/Comment: The University of Central Florida is referenced in a GMU Foundation report as a comparable institution. The amount of money raised by its President, John Hitt, totally eclipsed President Merten's efforts. Faculty donations (as a percentage of total number of single donors) to the GMU endowment are off the charts – about 61%. There is very little recognition of what faculty contribute to the institution, compared to administrators. Why can the University of Central Florida manage so well with its endowment and we do not? It seems like faculty take the lead at GMU, not President Merten.

Rector question: Reference for the 61% unclear.

Senator Follow-up: According to terms of what single donors gave as faculty . (No information about absolute dollar figure).

Rector noted that he had served on the GMU Foundation Board for a number of years before (serving on) the BOV. A large percentage of contributions come from a relatively small number of individuals/institutions. We need to understand the figures, not to demean or denigrate the contributions of the faculty. How Central Florida raised so much money is an interesting issue; we are looking for models where institutions gained a great deal of funding from other than usual sources. For example, by leveraging their land, the University of California at Irvine, found a way to raise a lot of money, as well as its position in the community. The University of Wisconsin gained a lot of money through intellectual property via faculty invention of a vitamin B supplement. When the University of Virginia had a big cutback in state funding around 1980, they began to leverage their real estate to improve their endowment. They own the Boars' Head Inn and a contiguous golf course. He added that he does not know about the University of Central Florida. He asked Chair of the Faculty Senate Peter Pober to provide more information.

Senator Comment: Alan Merten has not raised a lot of money. (When) looking at other relatively new universities, Alan Merten still hasn't raised a lot.

Rector: Some could argue that the growth of academia is most important. If you consider the whole pie i.e. income, construction over the last 10-15 years is phenomenal. Money has been received from state, public-private partnerships. When you judge an individual, the BOV sets up criteria. The ability to raise money is an increasingly important part of criteria. There are other parts too – as a good university and community leader; a tough job. I have been in public positions of leadership. President Merten has done a good job in this, with all the harassment and difficulties you get from the community, alumni, faculty, and students. The Board was to be balanced in its judgment and we think he has done a good job; (otherwise), we would not have negotiated extensions with him.

Rector Volgenau also had the opportunity to observe GMU President George Johnson and is favorably impressed with their efforts to create an institution which is really emerging. Getting money is very important, but getting good students, faculty, high academic standards is also important.

Chair Peter Pober welcomed Dean Lloyd Griffiths of the Volgenau School of Engineering.

Dean Griffith: The name change to the Volgenau School of Information Technology and Engineering was the result of a committee of stakeholders. In 1985 the School was focused on IT, today it's a very broad term – all the way to higher end research – branching into non-IT areas. CEIE (Civil, Environmental, and Infrastructure Engineering) is growing strongly in environmental engineering, sustainability. The new department of Bioengineering was approved by SCHEV, with eight faculty, at a time we could add faculty with Rector Volgenau's generous donation of \$5M to fund faculty positions. We were in a position to make good offers in Environmental and Bioengineering attracting more women to the field. (With) some of the things going on, name to better reflect the nature. Our goal is just to become “the Volgenau School,” known well. To capitalize on intellectual property, great universities on the technical side known by the companies they spawn on the side, based on research. We need to encourage this – lease space to new companies.

What am I concerned about? # 1 Faculty and staff salaries. There is a serious salary inversion for longer faculty, making less than newbies, also true of staff. Scholarship is definitely better now, stronger applicant pool, some lost to better scholarship offers at other institutions. We need more scholarship money – dean has a fundraising role. #2 Sustainability of programs - #'s of people to keeping them ___ is relatively small, if we lose them, we will do damage to them. This is not a particularly easy time to raise funds – Nguyen \$5M gift – we had to raise \$10M matching to get this. That's about where we are. Thank you. (Applause).

Finally, Chair Peter Pober noted that Dean Ed Rhodes of the School of Public Policy was called away on an emergency meeting, and will reschedule.

The Special Called Meeting of the Faculty Senate to Consider Revisions to the Faculty Handbook will take place on Wednesday March 23, 2011 at 3:00 pm in Robinson Hall B113. In response to a question raised about when the meeting materials will be distributed, Faculty Handbook Committee Chair Rick Coffinberger reported that they are now being reviewed by the Provost, and will be distributed in advance of the meeting.

Provost Peter Stearns reminded faculty about the Budget Forum scheduled for March 9th. The basic news still is that we will receive less money this year than the year before. Some additional funding was received (approximately \$9M), some of which will be applied to offset tuition increase. Legitimate for politicians to report an uptick in funding, but GMU still receives less (than before). (Budget Forum March 9th slides appear on the Budget Office website at <http://budget.gmu.edu/budtownmtg030911.pdf>).

III. New Business - Committee Reports

A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee - no report.

Academic Policies – Janette Muir, Chair

The AP Committee has the exciting job of looking at catalog copy. The APAC Committee gives us suggestions throughout the year.

Motion: Catalog Requirements for Degrees

Catalog year refers to the setting of course and non-course requirements within academic programs as stated in the school and college section of a specific catalog. Catalog year does not set academic policies

other than program requirements in place. For more information, see the Knowledge of University Policies section of the [Student Rights and Responsibilities](#) section. Not all programs and degree components are available in all catalogs. For any one degree, all requirements must be met as stated in a single catalog. The only exception is that Bachelor's degree students may select a minor from another catalog year for which they are eligible, as noted below.

Bachelor's degree candidates may choose to graduate under the terms of any catalog in effect during their enrollment in degree status. Students who have been inactive for five or more years or who have attended another institution without prior approval from their academic dean or director must graduate under a catalog in effect after their re-admission and during their enrollment in degree status.

Master's and doctoral degree candidates who have been continuously enrolled may choose to graduate under the terms of any catalog in effect during their enrollment in degree status. Students who have been inactive more than one year, however, may be required by their program to graduate under a catalog in effect after they have been granted permission to re-enroll.

In no case may a student choose the requirements of a future catalog year that take effect after the student's degree is anticipated.

Requirements for Undergraduate Programs

Declaration of Major

To plan a sound academic program, undergraduates should select a degree and major as soon as it is practical but no later than four weeks before the end of the sophomore year. To declare a major, students should confer with the appropriate advisor in the new major program. Students approaching the recommended point for declaring a major, but still uncertain of their choice, should consult the Academic Advising Center, Student Union Building I, Room 304, advisor@gmu.edu. Note that all degree components including general education, majors and concentrations must be contained in a single catalog year. See note under Catalog Requirements for Degrees for exception regarding minors.

Rationale:

Mason's policy has been that students must graduate under a single catalog year, with all degree components (major, concentration, minor, general education) included. All of these components except minors are required to be in the same catalog year, because of the internal coherence of academic programs as they are portrayed in Banner. We have found increasing interest in one exception to the policy, which would be to allow students to select a minor that is not included in their catalog year (but is included in a catalog effective during their enrollment in degree status). Therefore APAC has approved recommending to the Faculty Senate that this one exception be approved.

The attached catalog copy has proposed updates intended to accomplish three things:

1. allow the exception described above
2. in general, simplify the language
3. clarify that, in no circumstances may a student graduate from a new program that will not officially exist until the student has graduated

(Occasionally we find that students are aware of new programs being developed, and want to graduate from them before they are officially in effect -- returning to the internal consistency within Banner, and to logic, not to mention SACS and SCHEV sensibilities -- this is something that we cannot do.)

Discussion:

Senator Question: Are students allowed to go backward to a different catalog year to go through an easier degree program?

Susan Jones, University Registrar: Students come in with a set a requirements. Academic policies may change as requirements are set by the year. It is University policy to say they have to meet requirements in the year they came in, but we cannot compel them.

Senator Follow-up: What if student comes in 2010, and wants to go to another year, such as 2006?

Registrar: They cannot do this, they cannot go back prior to year entered. They can change to year when they are enrolled, and can go to a less rigorous (future) program.

The motion was approved unanimously.

Academic Policies is now working on scheduling/calendar and welcomes suggestions.

Budget and Resources: June Tangney, Chair

With thanks to Rick Coffinberger, the faculty salary data are now posted on the web. Access is available using faculty password. Please contact me jtangney@gmu.edu with any concerns about summer salary. The Committee is also working on credit for independent study and related activities.

Faculty Matters: Doris Bitler, Chair

We have nothing new to report.

Nominations: Jim Bennett, Chair

Call for nominations for faculty representatives to the BOV Committees has been distributed. If you're interested, nominate yourself.

You do not have to be a tenured faculty member to run.

Organization and Operations: Star Muir, Chair

Motion to amend the Academic Initiative Committee Charge:

(proposed revisions underlined)

Academic Initiative Committee Charge:

A. To fulfill faculty responsibilities for curriculum oversight within the University:

- 1) Gather accurate information from the Provost's Office to review
 - a) Initial, current and projected course and program enrollment;
 - b) Any Memorandum of Understanding or similar governing document or contract specifying arrangements between George Mason University and the host government, state, or responsible organization;

- c) Reports presented to any created governance structure such as a Board of Governors between George Mason University and any host government, state, or responsible organization;
- d) Vetting and approval processes for faculty hiring and course offerings;
- e) Information about resources, pay scales and other financial information relevant to faculty support, faculty and staff hiring, and curriculum development.

2) Provide a regular report to the Faculty Senate every semester.

B. Function as a faculty liaison from initial planning through implementation and continuing operations on major global education projects (involving multiple academic units or emanating from the central administration), participate in discussions of major additional projects, and provide support for appropriate new initiatives

C. Create sub-committees as necessary within the Committee to ensure adequate attention is paid to the variety of satellite campus locations and opportunities.

D. Committee representation of faculty from no less than five different academic units to serve staggered two-year terms. The Vice President for Global and International Strategies (or the functional equivalent in the Provost's Office) will serve on this Committee and will provide regular reports and updates on ongoing and new initiatives.

Rationale: 1) Clarification is provided as to what kind of liaison relationship was provided by the Committee, and that the Committee functions both in a review capacity and in a supportive capacity as appropriate; 2) Now that the Provost's Global Affairs position is more stable, there should be a structural recognition that they are party to the Committee information-gathering and discussion.

Discussion:

Senator Question: Is the Vice President a voting position?

S. Muir, Chair: This question was left to the Faculty Senate. We could insert clause as a non-voting member.

A motion was made and seconded to insert "as a non-voting member" in Section D (second sentence) as follows: The Vice President for Global and International Strategies (or the functional equivalent in the Provost's Office) will serve on this Committee as a non voting member and will provide regular reports and updates on ongoing and new initiatives.

Senator Question: Is there a customary approach across the university for committees which involve both faculty and administrators?

Chair of the Senate: This is different from committee to committee. Faculty have final control over curriculum. The Academic Initiatives Committee was designed to be a faculty committee and responsibility.

Senator Question: Is there authority to say the Vice President will serve on this committee?

S. Muir, Chair: Sure. We're the Faculty Senate. This person is responsible for many of the initiatives this committee will oversee.

Senator Question: Are we overstepping to say they will (participate)?

Senator Comment: If we allow the administrator to vote, we will have six voting members.

Chair Pober noted that the committee charge specifies that there will be at least 5 members.

Senator Question: Is it possible to elaborate on the portion that asks that we “provide support for new initiatives”?

S. Muir: Chair: For example, somebody knows someone from abroad who it might be helpful to bring in. There was some confusion whether to guard over initiatives or could they bring additional people to the table to discuss initiatives.

Senator Comment: Strikes me as odd that a committee chair would feel it's outside their ambit to invite people.

Senator Question: Does the rest of the committee approve of this charge? Is there more to know as they have to report to the Faculty Senate? Urged Senate to go slow and not change the charge.

Chair of the Senate: We received a shortened report from the AI Committee. The Chair of the AIC concerns were thus delayed, duly noted that report did not come last semester.

Senator Comment: The AIC was intended to be an oversight committee as part of an effort to be made aware of new initiatives, not to be critical of them. It is to be hoped that if the initiative is considered by faculty to be appropriate that they would support it without having that have to be written into the committee charge.

Senator motion: A motion was made to delete the phrase “and provide support for appropriate new initiatives” from B.

Discussion on the Motion:

Senator Comment: Back in 2008, the vision as quoted in the Faculty Senate Minutes and the Executive Committee minutes was to help channel faculty concerns, and to provide faculty with oversight. (The language without the deletion as proposed in Motion is) a way to clarify to the committee the role they are to serve. This (committee) is not to be purely a security guard and a group that asks very pointed, antagonistic questions, but instead a Committee that would be cooperative (to provide) a win/win for university/students. The current structure of the charge leads to a more antagonistic culture which is not very healthy and interferes with progress/intent of committee to serve.

Senator Comment: As Chair of O&O when the existing charge was written, I can say it was the case that the Provost requested that this committee be set up, shortly after the Executive Board had requested O&O to set up a committee that would be informed of new academic initiatives originating in the Provost's office and be part of these initiatives. The Provost objected to some of the aspects of the committee charge as first phrased, and after discussion in the beginning of the next academic year (Fall

2009), the committee amended the charge in a number of aspects consistent with the Provost's concerns. The committee charge as it stands allows for both support and concerns to be expressed.

Senator Comment: I was Chair of the Faculty Senate when the AIC was created. It is an oversight committee. To add the phrase "to provide support" is not a way to solve personnel problems which seem to have arisen within the committee.

The motion to amend the charge by adding "as a non-voting member" to Section D. was approved with one negative vote.

The motion to amend the proposed revision to the charge by deleting "'and provide support for appropriate new initiatives" in Section B. was approved.

The motion as amended was approved by voice vote..

Allocation of Senate Seats 2011-2012

Professor Muir presented the allocation for 2011-12, urging faculty who are interested to contact their units to let them know.

To: Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

From: O&O Committee

Date: February 23, 2011

Subject: Apportionment of Senate Seats for 2011-2012

Process: The Senate Charter, in Section 1.B., provides the rules for apportioning Senators among the academic units. The Committee on Operations and Organization is charged with performing the calculations and determining the allocation of Senate seats.

Summary of Results: The details of the calculations are provided on the attached chart. Here is a summary of the results:

- The College of Health and Human Services gains one Senator, moving from three Senators in 2010-2011 to four Senators in 2011-2012.
- The Volgenau School for Engineering loses one Senator, moving from six Senators in 2010-2011 to five Senators in 2011-2012.

- The allocation of Senators to all other academic units remains unchanged.
- As in the previous year, ICAR (now the School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution) and the Krasnow Institute individually do not meet the threshold requirement as defined in Section I.B.1. of the Charter. Thus, they are pooled into a single collegiate unit for the purposes of allocating Senate seats. The result is that SCAR and Krasnow together are represented by one Senator.

Data: As in previous years, these results are based on Instructional Faculty FTE data provided by Institutional Research and Reporting. Thanks go to Dr. Kris Smith, Associate Provost for IRR, and Mr. John Dooris, Institutional Research Analyst, who were instrumental in providing the data. The Senate Charter reads “The number of senators representing each collegiate unit... shall be determined... based on the [FTE size] on February 1st of each year....” The data used in the calculations are the official census data as of Fall 2010. These are the latest official Instructional Faculty FTE data that were available on February 1, 2011.

Instructional FTE and Headcount by Unit (Fall 2010) and Faculty Senate Bid Apportionment for 2011-2012

Academic Unit	Status	Instructional Faculty		Academic Unit	% of total Instructional FTE	x50	2010-11 Allocation	2011-12 Allocation	Change
		2010 HC	2010 FTE						
College of Education and Human Development	Full Time	114	114.0	College of Education and Human Development	0.12	6.13	6	6	0
	Part Time	215	65.0						
	Total	329	179.0						
College of Health and Human Services	Full Time	71	71.0	College of Health and Human Services	0.08	3.79	3	4	1
	Part Time	112	39.8						
	Total	183	110.8						
College of Humanities and Social Sciences	Full Time	386	386.0	College of Humanities and Social Sciences	0.33	16.73	17	17	0
	Part Time	244	103.0						
	Total	630	489.0						
College of Science	Full Time	176	176.0	College of Science	0.13	6.68	7	7	0
	Part Time	54	19.3						
	Total	230	195.3						
College of Visual and Performing Arts	Full Time	63	63.0	College of Visual and Performing Arts	0.07	3.31	3	3	0
	Part Time	80	33.7						
	Total	143	96.7						
School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution	Full Time	19	19.0	School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution*	0.02	0.79	1	1	0
	Part Time	14	4.0						
	Total	33	23.0						
Krasnow Institute	Full Time	9	9.0	Krasnow Institute*	0.01	0.31		0	0
	Part Time	0	0.0						
	Total	9	9.0						
School of Management	Full Time	80	80.0	School of Management	0.07	3.29	3	3	0
	Part Time	51	16.2						
	Total	131	96.2						
School of Law	Full Time	36	36.0	School of Law	0.04	1.86	2	2	0
	Part Time	67	18.3						
	Total	103	54.3						
School of Public Policy	Full Time	44	44.0	School of Public Policy	0.03	1.63	2	2	0
	Part Time	13	3.5						
	Total	57	47.5						
Volgenau School of Engineering	Full Time	121	121.0	Volgenau School of Engineering	0.11	5.50	6	5	-1
	Part Time	126	39.7						
	Total	247	160.7						
Academic Unit Total	Full Time	1119	1119.0	Academic Unit Total	1.00	50.00	50	50	0
	Part Time	976	342.4						
	Total	2095	1461.4						

*As per the Faculty Senate Charter (Section I. B. 1.), “All independent Collegiate Units, Institutes, or Academic Units which do not individually equal or exceed the threshold size will be pooled into a single collegiate unit for the purposes of allocating Senate seats.” The School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution and the Krasnow Institute will jointly determine who will fill their single slot for 2011-2012.

B. Other Committees – no report.

IV. Other New Business -none.

V. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty

Senator Comment: The Senator asked why the Senate invites Deans as guests at the beginning of Senate meetings.

Response:Chair of the Senate: This was the Chair’s initiative as a means to increase communication

Senator Comment: I have learned a great deal, find it useful, and want it to continue.

Senators in general confirmed this view and the Chair announced that the practice will continue.

Senator Question: Requested update on retirement changes sought by the state.

Response: Linda Harber, Associate Vice President, Human Resources: There are no changes in the ORP, it remains at 10.4%. For VRS, the 5% salary increase goes to offset 5% increase in VRS pre tax contribution. So there will be a slight reduction in take-home pay. Cash match required for 403B – we will see.

Senator Follow-up: Does this mean that bonuses are not included, hence a lower threshold?

Response: Linda Harber: Yes.

Danielle Miller, GMU Student Ambassador, announced that G-Bay is GMU's annual benefit auction run by students will be held March 3 from 6:00-10:00 PM in the Johnson Center. Many student organizations are trying to raise money for student scholarships. Flyers distributed to faculty mailboxes

Senator Comment: According to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, a bill coming out of the House will reduce Pell Grants, will inflict hardships on many VA students, especially at GMU. He urges faculty to contact their Senators, identifying themselves as college professors, and oppose the bill.

VI. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Trencher
Secretary