

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
APRIL 6, 2011
Robinson Hall B113, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

Senators Present: Ernest Barreto, Sheryl Beach, Jim Bennett, Alok Berry, Doris Bitler, John Cantiello, Jack Censer, Rick Coffinberger, Jose Cortina, Maggie Daniels, Yvonne Demory, Daniel Garrison, Jorge Haddock, Margret Hjalmarson, Mark Houck, David Kuebrich, Howard Kurtz, Alan Merten, Linda Monson, Jean Moore, Adam Mossoff, Janette Muir, Star Muir, Paula Petrik, Frank Philpot, Peter Pober, Pierre Rodgers, Jim Sanford, Suzanne Scott, Suzanne Slayden, Ray Sommer, Thomas Speller, June Tangney, Eva Thorp, Shirley Travis, Susan Trencher, Iosif Vaisman, Nigel Waters, Harry Wechsler, Phil Wiest, Stanley Zoltek.

Senators Absent: Heibatollah Baghi, Vikas Chandhoke, Lloyd Cohen, Nicole Darnall, Betsy DeMulder, Robert Dudley, Kelly Dunne, Mark Ginsberg, Jack Goldstone, Lloyd Griffiths, Frances Harbour, Susan Hirsch, Dimitrios Ioannou, Dan Joyce, James Olds, Daniel Polsby, William Reeder, Earle Reybold, Edward Rhodes, Joe Scimecca, Peter Stearns, John Zenelis.

Visitors Present: Laura Bolt, *Broadside*; Rick Davis, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education; Pat Donini, Deputy Director/Employee Relations Director, Human Resources; Kim Eby, Associate Provost, Faculty Development and Director, Center for Teaching Excellence; Esther Elstun, Professor Emerita, Modern and Classical Languages; Renate Guilford, Assistant Provost, Enrollment Planning & Administration; Linda Harber, Associate Vice President, Human Resources and Payroll; Robin Herron, Associate Director, Office of Media and Public Relations; Corey Jackson, /Director, Equity and Diversity Services; Reuben Jones, Academics Editor, Connect2Mason.com; Susan Jones, University Registrar; Leroy LaFleur, University Libraries; Sharon Pitt, Executive Director, DOIT; Claudia Rector, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs; Linda Schwartzstein, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs/Vice President, Enrollment Services; Bill Sutton, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering; Joy Taylor, Director, Learning Support Services, DoIT; Brian Walther, Senior Associate University Counsel.

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

II. Approval of the Minutes of February 9, 2011, March 2, 2011, and March 23, 2011: The minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Announcements

Chair Peter Pober announced that GMU has the number one speaker in the U.S. at the American Forensic Association National Individual Events Tournament for the first time in our history.

The Chair announced the presence of President Merten, who as scheduled each semester, was present with prepared remarks and to answer questions.

In response to a request for clarification of the presence of a quorum that arose re March 23rd meeting (when it was announced that a quorum no longer existed), Chair Peter Pober explained that the rules require a consistent quorum

President Merten: President Alan Merten restated thanks to all for their work over the past 15 years. Noted that the last two weeks * have been very emotional for himself and Mrs. Merten. He and Mrs. Merten will stay in the area, and he will have a faculty appointment at GMU, the exact terms of which were as yet unknown.

Re the search for successor: Hoping for best transition possible and does not see a separation between themselves and GMU; noting that their (President and Mrs. Merten) first priority is to ourselves, second priority is GMU Search for a Successor: we want the best transition we can possibly have. He has told Rector Volgenau that he will help in any way he's asked in the selection of a new president, but will stay out of the process. Sally and I want to be part of university, to do whatever is possible to guarantee success of the next president. "The next president may not have to go through reaccreditation, I've been through two." In a conversation with Rector Volgenau about a week ago, President Merten was asked (May meeting of the Executive BOV session) to provide recollections of search process in 1996, and involvement in other search processes. The Faculty Handbook is relatively precise with respect to the faculty role in appointment of academic administrators. (See [Faculty Handbook](#) Section 1.2.5 Faculty Participation in the Selection of Certain Members of the Central Administration). On April 13th, the Executive Committee of the BOV will meet and the search and tuition will be on its agenda. Rector Volgenau created an Ad Hoc Search Committee composed of Visitors Lovey Hammel, Ed Newberry, and Carter Pate who have been asked to advise the Board next week on processes associated with the selection. President Merten expects that a search committee, with a mechanism for faculty participation will be created as well as to make a decision on a search firm, as is typically done. President Merten has been contacted by several search firms already and has referred them to Rector Volgenau. (In his view) the BOV has plenty of time to do the search " the right way." (For) Presidents who give two years notice, this often means that the search (has) to be extended; thinks the importance of keeping candidates confidential is extremely important (reference to Florida sunshine laws); thinks it's a mistake to bring in one finalist – either up or out. Or when people have multiple candidates for a long period of time (over 7 days). "There are a lot of things people do wrong in the process".

Senator comment: Pleased that there has been a Presidential Task Force set up to seek input from members of the Mason community on their interactions and experiences with the University Police Department) and is delighted that (Chair of the Faculty Senate) Peter Pober will serve as co-chair. Expressed hopes that the faculty would be elected by the Faculty Senate.

Chair Pober: The Task Force Executive Committee has a meeting tomorrow, and includes a whole group of myriad disciplines. An announcement about two different open forums will be distributed soon. Membership already been picked, but does not necessarily preclude additional members. There will be a separate investigation of (a specific) incident by an outside expert, separate from the Task Force, which has a broader agenda than the incident.

Senator question: What do you think direction the university should go in to to be better and better?

President Merten: One question to be addressed by my successor is size. We have grown from 22,000 to 32,500 students. We are struggling with how big we should get. I met yesterday with four school superintendents in northern Virginia who do not take kindly to limits. (There is the)... question of size and paying for increase in size of institution. The Governor's Higher Education Bill was passed by the General Assembly (President Merten noted that he serves on committee with 5 other higher education leaders in the state.).

First issue for next president:

- 1- (size) How big? Balance between undergraduate/graduate/doctoral students
- 2- Commercialization of intellectual property. We develop things we get kudos for – we weren't producing enough intellectual property fifteen years ago, but now we are.
- 3- We have a lot of land – how to use it to benefit academic mission of university and support of community?

All three issues have strong financial emphases to them. Governor has provided some financial help. The Chair thanked President Merten and expressed his appreciation for everything he has done.

The Chair welcomed Dean Haddock from the School of Management.

Remarks: Dean Jorge Haddock, School of Management thanked the Senate for the opportunity to share some of the accomplishments and many ongoing projects at the School of Management. At the School of Management, we strongly believe that our responsibility goes beyond providing our students and business leaders with vigorous academic courses. We feel we must take it upon ourselves to create a future and to build a community that we are proud to pass on to future generations. And as we create this future, we're very proud of recent accomplishments and ongoing projects. We are ranked 86th in the University of Texas at Dallas ranking of the top 100 North American business schools for research productivity. Our faculty received more than half a million dollars in research grants over the past year, including a \$400,000 National Science Foundation grant, enabling them to remain research active and increase their publication rates. In the 2011 U.S. News & World Report ranking just released on March 15, our evening MBA programs jumped to #59 among all part-time MBA programs in the US. We maintained our ranking as one of the top 100 undergraduate business programs according to US News & World Report. Donations to the School of Management have increased more than 100% over the last year, allowing us to offer more scholarships to students. In order to engage more of our students outside of the classroom, we have made plans to implement a faculty mentoring program where full time faculty meet with students to discuss how our academic disciplines connect with various professional careers including research related careers. The program will begin formally this coming Fall. We established the Center for Global Business Innovation (CGBIT) as one of three centers of excellence to increase our visibility and rankings to meet the increased need for international education and research. During the years, we established or strengthened active partnerships with academic institutions in ten countries including: China, Colombia, Egypt, Germany, South Korea, Peru, Puerto Rico, Russia, Switzerland, and Turkey. We began discussions or continued discussions on relationships with 74 institutions in 28 countries. These relationships bring us the opportunity to collaborate on research, faculty and student exchanges, and executive education programs. We expanded the full-time MBS enrollment from 30 students in 2009 to 47 students in 2010 and increased the incoming GMAT average from 601 to 625. Developed and successfully launched the MBA Consulting Project (a three-credit course where students provide consulting services to local businesses). We have increased the number of graduate assistantships offered in our graduate programs. The first students to complete our MS in Real Estate Development Program anticipate graduation this May. Developed and designed the National defense track EMBA curriculum, which was also approved by the GPC and the faculty in AY 09-10. The new minor in Entrepreneurship was approved, with two tracks. One track, in the Study of Entrepreneurship, will be administered by CHHS. The track in Entrepreneurship Practice will be administered in SOM. We are designing collaborative executive education programs with several on-campus units, including the Department of Health Administration (CHHS), School of Law (LAW), School of Public Policy (SPP), and Recreation, Health and Tourism (RHT). We also have a number of initiatives that are underway. The beginnings of a distance education EMBA program were started by AY 09-10 with meetings held with Goodlett McDaniel, representatives from Colloquy, and a meeting at the Cisco Telepresence site in Herndon Virginia in May 2010 attended by the Academic Director. The Associate Dean for Executive

Programs and the Academic Director of Executive Programs worked with the Senior Associate Dean at IT&E to develop and design the MS Management of Secure Information Systems Program. (This program was subsequently approved by the GPC and the SOM faculty in AY10-11. It is currently pending SCHEV approval and is scheduled for launch in Fall 2011. We have intensified our efforts to obtain donor funding for a Center in Entrepreneurship and Innovation.

These are just a few of the many ongoing projects and accomplishments that we are happy to share with the faculty senate, but obviously does not encompass all that we are doing at the School of Management. As we move into the future, I look forward to working with you as we continue to work towards accomplishing our many goals, including our goal of becoming a top 50 ranked business school in the US. Thank you all for your time today and I invite you to ask any questions you might have.

Senator Question: When will the former Canadian Prime Minister talk?

Dean Haddock: At a breakfast on April 21st, please email me if you are interested in attending the breakfast.

Senator Question: Does SOM include sustainability studies?

Dean Haddock: There are many areas in which course curriculum address these topics, as well as at conferences and interactions with groups (such as) Chambers of Commerce.

The Chair welcomed Dean Censer from the College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Remarks: Dean Jack Censer College of Humanities and Social Sciences

The Dean recalled that he served as a Faculty Senator for two terms. He provided just a sample of CHSS accomplishments which has a college of 10,000 students and 700 full time faculty. Most importantly, we have recovered from our enrollment sag three years ago and have gone beyond it, so we can do more. The Department of Modern and Classical Languages now offers courses through the intermediate level in Farsi, Turkish, and Portuguese. With the Smithsonian Institute, which has one of the top programs in the world, we have formed a new Masters in Decorative Arts under the Department of History and Art History. Classes will begin this fall. Five years ago, our college (with the exception of the Psychology Department) had \$10 million in sponsored program funding. Last year we experienced extraordinary growth to \$18 million, and this year have received \$20 million (so far) with one quarter to go. Funding is well distributed throughout the college. This allows us to do more research, but we have not abandoned instructional research. Professor David Weisburd, Mason Distinguished Professor in the Department of Criminology, Law and Society, won the 2010 Stockholm Prize in Criminology for his work on improvements in policing. Dean Censer also recalled his best friend, Professor Roy Rosenzweig, who passed away in 2007, and how 300 of Roy's friends raised \$1.2 million dollars for the Center for History and New Media, which will be named after Professor Rosenzweig in honor of his tremendous contributions. We are also very excited about the undergraduate student (Alexandra Tyson) who won the Truman Prize. The David King award was won by CHSS Professors Paula Gilbert (Modern and Classical Languages) and Marion Deshmukh (History and Art History) this year. The English Department is opening up a Bachelor of Fine Arts in Creative Writing. Dean Censer particularly noted working with fantastic colleagues, including department chairs, that make the college like family in many respects. The Dean then invited questions.

Senator Question: Re the field of Neuroscience and the way it involves others interests.

Dean Censer: We put together a Philosophy/Political Science/Economics major with the School of Public Policy. The major also draws very good students. A similar model to those involving Neuroscience studies in which involved units contribute equally are among collaborative efforts.

Senator Question: Does CHSS bring in any grant money from the Koch Brothers?

Dean Censer: Zero of the grant money comes from them, but there is donor funding from the Koch brothers that goes through the Foundation, but does not come from the Dean We have received funding from the National Endowment of the Humanities for the Center for History and New Media. We mine assiduously anyone who wants to give to resources for what we want to do. We have a wide diverse unit encompassing wide ideologies, and other differences, we stand for academic freedom.

Senator follow up comment: As long as it is disclosed, agrees with policy.

Dean Censer: Confirmed that this is disclosed.

Chair Announcement

The Special Called Meeting of the Faculty Senate with Special Guests State Delegate David Bulova and State Senator Chap Petersen, will take place Wednesday, April 20, 2011 – 3:00 p.m, Robinson Hall B113. Please send questions to Professor Debbie Boehm-Davis, Chair of the External Academic Relations Committee.

IV. Unfinished Business

Motion: That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook with no further revisions at this time other than those necessary to correct typographical and grammatical errors.

[Note: A motion to "refer to the Faculty Handbook Committee with instructions" is in order.]

Purpose:

The purpose of this meeting is to consider the proposed revisions to the Faculty Handbook (2009). The revisions, which are available on the Faculty Senate website (<http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/>), appear as deletions (strikethrough) and insertions (underlined) to the current text. The new text as it would appear if the revisions are approved is also provided.

This paragraph was included in the background material submitted to the Faculty Senate for its special meeting in Fall, 2008 to approve the Faculty Handbook:

"... Such approval does not mean that future changes cannot be considered from time to time as needed. With modern technology and using the procedures described in the revised Handbook, it is now possible to treat the Handbook as a living, evolving document that can be updated and improved with relative ease on an ongoing basis."

Two groups have been meeting this last year to propose revisions to the Faculty Handbook. One group was convened by Brian Walther, Senior Associate University Counsel, and consisted of representatives from the Provost's Office, Human Resources, and the faculty. The other group was the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee, a University Committee that reports to the Faculty Senate. Each group reviewed the other group's proposed revisions, and the Provost has reviewed and approved all of them.

It remains for the Faculty Senate to approve the changes.

All revisions approved by both the administration and the Faculty Senate will then be submitted to the Board of Visitors for final approval.

Proposed Revisions to the Faculty Handbook, March 23, 2011:

http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/FacultyHandbook/Proposed_FH_Revisions_2011-forApril-6,2011_FS_Meeting.pdf

Side-by-Side Templates Illustrating Proposed Revisions, March 23, 2011:

http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/FacultyHandbook/2011_Faculty_Handbook_Revision_Templates-2-for_April_6,_2011_Agenda.pdf

The Faculty Handbook (January 1, 2009): <http://www.gmu.edu/facstaff/handbook/>

Discussion

Professor Rick Coffinberger, Chair of the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee, re-introduced the motion first presented at the Special Meeting on March 23rd, which went on for an hour and fifteen minutes; however we had and then lost a quorum and could not vote. We made the corrections raised by Professor Sanford at the March 23rd meeting, and Section 2.7.3 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure was removed from the document in response to legal questions raised earlier. We consider the Faculty Handbook to be a living document and fully expect to come back next spring or late fall with revisions to 2.7.3 and some other items which have come in and with input from the Provost and Brian Walther's committee in advance .

Senator question: If we vote to approve changes today, done with changes for this year. What is the continuing body to bring issues to?

Professor Coffinberger: The continuing body is the Faculty Handbook Committee (Jim Bennett, Rick Coffinberger, and Suzanne Slayden) on behalf of the Faculty Senate. The way the Faculty Handbook is written, anyone can suggest changes, including the administration. We received several important suggestions to take up in the fall.

The motion was approved unanimously.

V. New Business - Committee Reports

A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee

Request for Faculty Senate recommendation to Emeritus rank

WHEREAS Dr. William J. (Jim) McAuley, Professor of Communications, has been recommended by Dr. Gary Kreps, Chair of the Department of Communication for emeritus status based on Professor McAuley's long record of excellent performance in academia and his record of outstanding work since his arrival at George Mason in all venues, university, college, department, and discipline, and,

WHEREAS the Faculty Handbook (Sec 2.2.7) states that professors with "ten or more years of service may be recommended for the rank of Emeritus," and Dr. McAuley will not have fully met the length-of service requirement upon his retirement,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE recommends William J. McAuley for Emeritus status in recognition of his contributions to George Mason University and wishes him well in his future endeavors.

Discussion

Senator Question: How many years has he been here? Is there a very unique circumstance?

Response: Six years. He has produced a large number of articles, and is the editor of a primary journal on gerontology issues. Everything they submitted to use documentation (of) excellence.

The Senate approved to move forward the request. The request still has to go to the BOV for approval.

Senate Evaluation of the President/Provost 2010-11

The Senate approved the acceptance of the Evaluation of the President/Provost 2010-11. It was noted that the evaluation has a different format this year, and preference was expressed for a summary in the future.

Survey Results

President/Provost Evaluation Responses AY 10-11

March 2011

Note that some committees did not provide responses to each question.

Question 1: During the past calendar year has the President or Provost announced initiatives or goals or acted upon issues that fall under the charge of your Committee? If so, was your Committee consulted by the President or Provost in a timely manner before the announcement or action? If not, do you believe your Committee should have been consulted? Would it have been helpful to have had the input of your Committee from the outset?

Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

Academic Policies: Nothing was announced that directly impacts our committee work. The Provost has assigned various Associate Provosts to work with this committee and these relationships have been quite fruitful.

Budget and Resources: It has been very helpful to be included in the twice monthly Budget and Planning Team meetings. This has given our committee a much better appreciation for how the budget is managed and for current budgetary challenges. The BPT has been welcoming.

Faculty Matters: In general, the Faculty Matters Committee was satisfied with consultation by the President and Provost.

Nominations: The Faculty Senate Nominations Committee had no reason to contact or engage President Merten.

With regard to the Provost, Stearns is quite good at providing "Provost's Appointments" to committees and task forces. The Provost could be more helpful by providing greater lead time when Faculty Representatives are sought for various posts.

Moreover, the Nominations Committee's task of finding Faculty to serve in these posts would be facilitated if more information were provided to the Nominations Committee in terms of, say, the Charge of the Task Force, the frequency of meetings, the expected location of meetings (particularly if not on the Fairfax Campus), etc. Overall, I have no complaints, but also believe that more cooperation and more advance notice would be mutually beneficial.

Organization and Operations: Regulatory Environment committee. O&O was gearing up to create a task force and the Provost indicated he was creating a University-wide committee. Proper consultation with the Faculty Senate occurred and faculty input was assured.

Responses from University Standing Committees and *ad hoc* Committees:

Academic Appeals: As far as I know, neither the President nor Provost announced initiatives or goals or acted upon issues that fall under the charge of the Academic Appeals Committee.

Athletic Council: President Merten was involved in the site visit for the NCAA certification of Mason's Athletics Programs. Sub-Committees of the Athletic Council assisted with the collection and approval of information used in Mason's written self study. President Merten met with members of the Athletic council to thank them for their participation. A designee from the Provost's office serves on the Athletic Council. We did not have any issues under my charge with either the President or the Provost.

External Academic Relations: No initiatives or goals were announced or acted upon.

Faculty Handbook Revision Committee: The Faculty Handbook Revision Committee has no contact with the President and will soon interact with the Provost regarding a small set of proposals for revising the Handbook. So far, no problems.

General Education: The gen ed committee continued its work on program assessment and course approval without consultation from the President or the Provost, nor was any required or sought.

Minority and Diversity Issues: The Minority and Diversity Issues Committee (MDIC) is not aware of any specific initiatives or goals related to diversity issues during this year, as it related to the committee's charge. An issue related to gender identity was discussed by one of the President's cabinet members, and the MDIC chair was appropriately involved with this.

2. Did your Committee seek information or input from the President or Provost or members of their staffs? If so, did they respond adequately and in a timely manner?

Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

Academic Policies: The AP Committee regularly works with members of the Provost's Office. In particular, Rick Davis, Michelle Marks, and Susan Jones have been very helpful. These leaders are always willing to meet with the AP Chair, or even attend an AP meeting as needed. They have been particularly helpful in gathering various stakeholders together to get input on topics concerning academic credit and calendar issues.

Budget and Resources: Linda Harber worked closely with Rick Coffinberger to obtain the updated faculty salary data for our website. Maurie Scherrens provided much helpful material in our quest to understand the use of direct cost funds from extramural funding sources. Provost Stearns was generous in helping fund the Faculty Senate reception for the BOV.

Faculty Matters: We have sought information from Provost Stearns and those on his staff. In all cases, we were satisfied with the timeliness and scope of the information provided.

Nominations: (*see #1*)

Organization and Operations: Sought feedback about the presence of institutes with regard to the change of ICAR to S-CAR and the allocation/sharing of Faculty Senate bids with the Krasnow institute. Provost responded immediately and directly with the needed information.

Responses from University Standing Committees and *ad hoc* Committees:

Academic Appeals: The Academic Appeals Committee sought information and input from members of the Provost's staff on the only case that came before the Committee this year. On the whole, the staff did respond adequately and in a timely manner as the Committee learned about and reviewed the case. However, I believe the Committee was not adequately informed about a delay in the case that lasted several months.

Athletic Council: No, the committee did not seek information from the President or the Provost.

External Academic Relations: Yes, we requested input from Betty Jolly. She met with the committee. She also proactively invited the members of the committee to participate in a "meet and greet" sponsored by the university with local legislators.

General Education: The committee has worked extensively with the Office of Institutional Assessment and particularly would like to thank Karen Gentemann and Ying Zhou of that office for their willingness to meet with the committee as often as required to advance the learning outcomes discussions and the assessment projects we have undertaken.

Minority and Diversity Issues: The MDIC has requested that the Diversity Statement be placed on the university website, so as to have greater visibility of this commitment. This statement was approved by the Faculty Senate February 17, 2010; approved by the Staff Senate May 4, 2010; and endorsed by a Student Senate Resolution May 6, 2010. This is to have been reviewed by the President's cabinet, for posting and/or a linkage to it. This would be helpful for furthering the mission of the MDIC, and to

encouraging organizational units to engage in proactive efforts consistent with the Diversity Statement. To date, this has not been posted or linked publicly.

Technology Policy: The committee had little or no interaction with the President and Provost. Provost appointee James Goodlet McDaniel was very, very helpful with committee issues and keeping us abreast of what was going on in the Provost's Office with regard to distance education.

Writing Across the Curriculum: The committee had little or no interaction with the President and Provost. Rick Davis was very helpful in helping us to interact with several departments which did not comply totally with the Senate's writing-intensive requirements.

3. Please suggest how you believe the President, Provost and/or their staffs might more effectively interact with your Committee in the future, if necessary.

Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

Academic Policies: There is not much cause for the President to care what goes on in the Academic Policies committee, so his interaction with us is unnecessary. The Provost Office is directly connected to the work we do and most of the time our interactions are satisfactory, especially as he assigns various staff to work with this committee as needed.

Budget and Resources: Involve the faculty senate earlier and more directly in decisions regarding the President's contract (renewal or extension). We hope to become involved earlier and more meaningfully when the search for a new President or Provost is initiated.

Faculty Matters: Provost Stearns, in comparison, meets with the Senate's Executive Committee regularly and attends Senate meetings on a regular basis.

Nominations: (See #1)

Organization and Operations: Just to make sure they know the gatekeeping function of O&O and can refer issues or individuals to us for proper tracking and dispersal across Senate and University committees.

Responses from University Standing Committees and *ad hoc* Committees:

Academic Appeals: In the case mentioned above, more timely communication would have been helpful and would be helpful in the future.

Athletic Council: No recommendations. Senior administrators who report to the President, and senior administrators who report to the Provost serve as members of the Athletic Council. They attend regularly and serve on the council's sub-committees.

External Academic Relations: I would like to work with Betty this spring to identify a mechanism for getting regular updates during the legislative session on issues of import to faculty.

Minority and Diversity Issues: The MDIC would like greater participation by a representative of the Office of Equity and Diversity Services in its meetings.

4. Please relate any additional information you may have regarding interactions between your Committee and the President or Provost or their staff.

Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

Academic Policies: No additional comments to add.

Budget and Resources: It would be helpful if the BOV would provide the faculty senate with explicit criteria for evaluating the president. The Rector has indicated several times that they have such criteria, but we have not been informed beyond very general criteria.

Faculty Matters: The Faculty Matters Committee has not been approached for consultation by either Provost Stearns or President Merten. As in the past, we encourage them to seek input from the committee in advance of any policy changes or institutional decisions that affect faculty.

Organization and Operations: Don't interact with the President at all. Seems relatively aloof from the Senate. The Provost and his staff have generally been responsive to queries, there are no complaints at this time.

Responses from University Standing Committees and *ad hoc* Committees:

Athletic Council: I am comfortable taking any issue or situation to the President or Provost with regard to student-athlete well being or academic performance. I receive the support necessary to continue in my role as Faculty Athletic Representative and Chair of the Athletic Council.

External Academic Relations: N/A.

Minority and Diversity Issues: The MDIC has kept the Office of Equity and Diversity Services up-to-date on many of its activities of the 2010-2011 academic year.

Academic Policies – no report.

Budget & Resources – June Tangney, Chair

We continue to attend the Budget Planning Team Meetings. The meetings are very informative. We continue to study the summer salary issue.

Faculty Matters – Doris Bitler, Chair

The Faculty Evaluation of Administrators will be distributed on-line on Monday, will be available through May 20th. Please encourage faculty in your units to respond; a higher response rate is needed.

Nominations – Jim Bennett, Chair

Two elections are in progress. We will not know how many faculty representatives to the Presidential Search Committee there will be until April 13th. We will also elect two alternates to the Presidential Search Committee.

Wayne Froman (CHSS) is nominated to fill a vacancy on the Academic Initiatives Committee.

By unanimous consent, Lloyd Cohen is nominated to fill a vacancy on the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee. No further nominations were made from the floor and the candidates were elected.

Organization & Operations – Star Muir, Chair

Letters have been sent out to the deans of various units for 2011-12 Senate allocation. Encourage your dean to conduct the elections promptly, we need to get this done as soon as possible.

MOTION TO AMEND THE SENATE ANNUAL EVALUATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE PROVOST

The text of the January 21, 2009 Senate Motion authorizing the Senate's annual evaluation of the President and the Provost appears below, as well as several proposed amendments (underlined and highlighted in yellow).

The original Resolution, plus the proposed amendments (underlined in yellow).

Introduction: The Faculty Senate currently conducts an annual evaluation in which the Faculty assesses the performance of the President, the Provost, and the Deans and Directors. While this assessment should be continued, it would also be useful to have the Senate conduct its own evaluation. Therefore the Faculty Matters Committee proposes the following motion:

Resolution: The elected members of the Faculty Senate will conduct an annual evaluation of how effectively the President and Provost have interacted with the Faculty Senate during the preceding academic year. The results of this assessment will be summarized by the Executive Committee in narrative form and promptly sent to the General Faculty and to the Board of Visitors as a separate mailing. The Senate Chair and the elected Faculty Representatives to the BOV will promptly discuss the report with the Board of Visitors and report back to the Senate. If the Senate determines it would be salutary, it will charge the Senate Chair to summarize and send the Faculty representatives' report to the General Faculty as a separate mailing. Otherwise, the Representatives report will go out only as part of the regular Minutes.

The following schedule will be observed:

March 1: By this date or earlier, the Senate Chair will distribute evaluative questions to the chairs of the Senate Standing Committees and also to the chairs of the ad hoc and University Committees that report to the Senate.

March 10: The chairs will submit their written responses.

April Senate Meeting: The Executive Committee will present the final report to the Faculty Senate. The Senate Chair will also promptly send the report to the General Faculty and all Members of the Board of Visitors as a separate mailing.

Next Meeting of the Board of Visitors: The Faculty Representatives to the BOV will discuss the Report with the Board of Visitors.

Next Meeting of the Faculty Senate: The Representatives will report back to the Senate. The Senate may decide to have a summary of this report promptly sent to the General Faculty as a separate mailing.

Explanation: The Executive Committee will solicit input from the chairs of the Senate Standing Committees, as well as from ad hoc and University Committees that report to the Senate), and then compose a draft version of an annual assessment report of the President and the Provost. This draft report will be presented for discussion, amendment, and approval by the elected members of the Senate at its April meeting. The approved report will then be sent to the General Faculty and Board of Visitors as a separate mailing.

The assessment will include but not be limited to the following issues:

- 1) Have the Senate and its committees been provided access to the President, the Provost and their staffs in a timely manner?
- 2) Have the President, Provost and their staffs provided the Senate requested information in a timely manner?
- 3) In the case of joint Senate-Administration committees or task forces, have the President, Provost and/or their staffs participated in a collegial and effective manner?
- 4) Have the President, Provost and their staffs complied with the Faculty Handbook?
- 5) In policies involving the future of the University that have the potential to have significant impact upon the nature of the University or upon the Faculty and their work, has the Senate been included in the planning process in a significant way from the beginning?

Rationale: Because the General Faculty “delegates to the Faculty Senate the responsibility for participation in governance at the university level” (Handbook, 1.3.1), the Senate interacts regularly with the President and Provost regarding “all governance issues not internal to any single school or college” (Handbook, 1.3.2). Given this mandate, the Senate has both a unique need for effective relations with the chief administrative officers and a unique perspective upon how well these officers are collaborating with the Senate. Accordingly, it is appropriate that the Senate make a separate annual evaluation of how effectively the President, the Provost, and their staffs, have interacted with the Senate and that it share this information with the General Faculty, and with the members of the Board of Visitors. The overall goal of this procedure is to ensure that both the General Faculty and the Board gain an understanding of the Faculty Senate’s perception of cooperation between the George Mason Central Administration and the Senate.

Rationale for the Proposed Amendments: It is important the process of evaluation be improved to guarantee that it is conducted in a timely manner and is effectively communicated to the General Faculty and the Board of Visitors.

Discussion:

Senator Comment: Basically the changes ensure there is a prompt turnaround and specific timeline. The chair of the Faculty Senate is responsible for the report's distribution.

Several Senators questioned the authority of the Faculty Senate to mandate that the Faculty Representatives to the BOV talk to the BOV about this. At least one Faculty Representative to the BOV is a Faculty Senator. The issue is that someone talks to the BOV about the report.

The Chair of the Faculty Senate is the only faculty member who serves on the BOV. Question arose regarding notification of the BOV regarding suggested changes: i.e. whether to direct the Committee to mail the report to the BOV; what the timing for notification should be (noting that the May BOV meeting always has many agenda items to deal with in May; concerns that if report raises issues about collaboration with administration and Faculty Senate, discussion would be useful rather than simple notification in order for appropriate dialogue to occur. A suggestion was made to ask for a special meeting with the Rector, to include the faculty reps to the BOV as well as the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. In essence, "mandate" equals "encourage" and there is no means to mandate that the BOV pay attention to the report.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the motion by removing the penultimate paragraph **Next Meeting of the Board of Visitors: The Faculty Representatives to the BOV will discuss the Report with the Board of Visitors.**

The amendment was approved.

A motion was made and seconded to add the following amendment:

As soon as feasible after the April Senate meeting, the Chair of the Faculty Senate will request a meeting with the BOV Executive Committee to discuss the report and will invite the Faculty Representatives to the BOV to participate in this meeting.

(The amendment also replaces the third proposed sentence in paragraph one of the resolution: "~~The Senate Chair and the elected Faculty Representatives to the BOV will promptly discuss the report with the Board of Visitors and report back to the Senate.~~") In the first line of the last paragraph "Chair of the Faculty Senate" replaces "representatives" so that the revised text reads: **Next Meeting of the Faculty Senate: The Chair of the Faculty Senate Representatives will report back to the Senate**

In response to a question raised as to whether we would request a meeting (only if there were issues of concern), a Senator responded that the meeting should be a regular occurrence. If we have a good report,

good to share the praise. A suggestion was made to ask the Rector about the report when he is here for his semi-annual visits to the Faculty Senate.

The amendment was approved.

The resolution was approved as amended, and appears below:

Resolution: The elected members of the Faculty Senate will conduct an annual evaluation of how effectively the President and Provost have interacted with the Faculty Senate during the preceding academic year. The results of this assessment will be summarized by the Executive Committee in narrative form and promptly sent to the General Faculty and to the Board of Visitors as a separate mailing. As soon as feasible after the April Senate meeting, the Chair of the Faculty Senate will request a meeting with the BOV Executive Committee to discuss the report and will invite the Faculty Representatives to the BOV to participate in this meeting. If the Senate determines it would be salutary, it will charge the Senate Chair to summarize and send the Faculty representatives' report to the General Faculty as a separate mailing. Otherwise, the Representatives report will go out only as part of the regular Minutes.

The following schedule will be observed:

March 1: By this date or earlier, the Senate Chair will distribute evaluative questions to the chairs of the Senate Standing Committees and also to the chairs of the ad hoc and University Committees that report to the Senate.

March 10: The chairs will submit their written responses.

April Senate Meeting: The Executive Committee will present the final report to the Faculty Senate. The Senate Chair will also promptly send the report to the General Faculty and all Members of the Board of Visitors as a separate mailing.

As soon as feasible after the April Senate meeting, the Chair of the Faculty Senate will request a meeting with the BOV Executive Committee to discuss the report and will invite the Faculty Representatives to the BOV to participate in this meeting.

Next Meeting of the Faculty Senate: The Chair of the Faculty Senate will report back to the Senate. The Senate may decide to have a summary of this report promptly sent to the General Faculty as a separate mailing.

B. Other Committees

Academic Initiatives Committee Report – Fall 2010

Academic Initiatives Committee Senate Report for fall Semester 2010

Dear Fellow Colleagues of the GMU Faculty Senate:

The Senate Academic Initiatives Committee met with Provost Peter Stearns on October 27, 2010 to review the university's academic initiatives. The provost described a number of initiatives, some of which have been formalized and some of which are still in the talking stages. Notes from this meeting are not available. Subsequently, on December 9, 2010 three members of the committee—Speller, Kiley, and Chong—met with Anne Schiller (then Interim Vice President for Global and International Strategies) who explained the organizational structure for the office; and noted that strategic planning goals and how to achieve them, including process flow, had not yet been developed. For an organization chart of Schiller's office, see <http://worldwide.gmu.edu/>.

Two committee members, Tom Kiley and Thomas Speller, and guest Roman Polyak (invited by the committee chair) met with Mason's Director of Russian Initiatives, Sergei Andronikov October 18, 2010. Andronikov described the current state of Mason's arrangement with Moscow State University. Students from Moscow State School of Economics, including those from their management department, can earn dual B.S. degrees in management and economics over a four-year duration. (Students in their fifth year can work in the U.S.) Currently, there are six students and, a rotation of Moscow State professors who each come to GMU to deliver a three week course teaching these students three hours per day five days a week. The classes are taught in Russian, but the intent sometime in the future is to teach in English and Russian. The students room together in an apartment and take courses in economics and management taught by the Russian professors. Mason pays the Russian educator for salary, room, and board, with the instructional rate set apparently below the Mason faculty rate structure, albeit Mason has many, diverse faculty salary structures. The Russian government pays for the flight costs of students and professors. The tuition and associated costs for a Russian student are approximately \$30k per year. According to Andronikov, it can be difficult to recruit Russian students because of the high tuition.

It was not clear yet how this arrangement provides value to Mason. Andronikov mentioned that the breakeven point for GMU was nine students and currently there are six. There is no planned exchange program with the Moscow State University nor explanation why. Director Andronikov he seemed unclear on the future direction for this Russian initiatives program. Kiley inquired about the courses and schedule for students, which Andronikov said he would send; however, he has not yet done so nor replied to Kiley's email reminder.

As next steps, the committee plans to meet with Anne Schiller, who was named Vice President of Global and International Strategies in the near future. We also plan to review Mason's academic initiatives in China and Korea.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the GMU Academic Initiatives Committee,

Thomas Speller (Chair)

Discussion: In response to a question raised, more detailed information will be provided. With the inclusion of Anne Schiller, Vice President for Global and International Strategies there is more opportunity to work together to ensure the quality of education is kept as high as we want it to be for faculty working here and faculty working abroad.

Senator Comment/Question: Raised concerns about communications problems (within the committee).
Response: A member of the committee responded that he did not come to the Senate to discuss the workings of the committee, but to make sure that accurate information about their activities is presented. (The chair of the committee added that the committee met with Anne Schiller on Monday and await more information about programs in China, reference to course syllabi and anything else we requested in writing.

VI. Other New Business

Rick Davis, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, will gladly entertain a return visit to discuss General Education, as there is not sufficient time remaining today.

VII. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty

Senator Comment: A Senator observed that we asked Sr. University Counsel Brian Walther at the Special Meeting concerning proposed revisions to the Faculty Handbook two weeks ago (March 23, 2011) to provide information about the Governor's Consolidated Salary Authorization and we have not yet received a response.

Response: We will ask Brian Walther for an update.

Senator Comment: The Board is voting on tuition increases. Compared to our peers in Virginia, we are low balling it. If we asked for a comparable increase in tuition, what would we do with it? Send ideas to June Tangney (jtangney@gmu.edu) .

Faculty are encouraged to attend the awards ceremony honoring the [2011 Teaching Excellence Awards](#) recipients on Monday, April 11, 2011 from 3:30-5:00 p.m. in the Center for the Arts Lobby.

A message was distributed earlier today from the Director of Classroom Technologies inviting faculty to the Candidate Presentations for Director of Classroom and Lab Technologies.

VIII. Adjournment : The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Trencher
Secretary, Faculty Senate