

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
APRIL 3, 2013
Robinson Hall B113, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

Senators Present: Dominique Banville, Scott Bauer, Sheryl Beach, Jim Bennett, Alok Berry, Lisa Billingham, Ángel Cabrera, John Cantiello, Rick Coffinberger, Charlene Douglas, Robert Dudley, Cody Edwards, Daniel Garrison, Janos Gertler, Mark Houck, Ghassan Husseinali, Dimitrios Ioannou, Kathryn Jacobsen, Dan Joyce, Linda Monson, Star Muir, William Reeder, Steven Rose, Mark Rozell, Jim Sanford, Joe Scimecca, Suzanne Scott, Suzanne Slayden, Bob Smith, Peter Stearns, June Tangney, Susan Trencher, Iosif Vaisman, Jenice View, Phil Wiest, John Zenelis, Stanley Zoltek.

Senators Absent: Kenneth Ball, Andrea Bartoli, Doris Bitler Davis, Jack Censer, Vikas Chandhoke, Lloyd Cohen, Arie Croitoru, Yvonne Demory, Mark Ginsberg, Jorge Haddock, Bruce Johnsen, David Kuebrich, Ning Li, Jian Lu, Jerry Mayer, Harold Morowitz, Elavie Ndura, Peter Pober, Daniel Polsby, Thomas Prohaska, Edward Rhodes, Pierre Rodgers, Lesley Smith, Debra Sprague, Susan Tomasovic, Anand Vidyashankar.

Visitors Present: Jessica Cain, Employee Relations Specialist, Human Resources/Payroll; Jennifer “JJ” Davis, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance; Esther Elstun, Professor *emerita*, Modern and Classical Languages; Dolores Gomez-Roman, University Ombudsman; Linda Harber, Associate Vice President, Human Resources/Payroll; Michelle Lim, Human Resources Faculty Business Partner; Geraldine Mobley, Equal Opportunity Specialist/Trainer, Office of Equity and Diversity Services; Janette Muir, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education; Claudia Rector, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs; Beth Roszkowski, Head, Arlington campus Library, University Libraries; Zachary Schrag, Professor of History and Art History and Chair, Computer Email Privacy Task Force; Walt Sevon, Executive Director, Technology Systems Division.

I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.

II. Announcements

Chair June Tangney welcomed President Cabrera. He introduced a graduate student visiting from the University of Virginia, to do research on us, to find out if interesting things are happening out of the University of Virginia. He also introduced J.J. Davis, our new Senior Vice President. She joined us four weeks ago from the University of Delaware, and is already so much fun and so productive. VP Davis thanked President Cabrera and looks forward to working with you, adding that she grew up in Burke. He then introduced Provost Stearns, who needs no introduction...

President Cabrera thanked the faculty for the role you played in the Vision process. Feedback provided from faculty shaped the Vision statement, citing the clear commitment to freedom of expression and thought, now one of the values. Faculty were influential in subtle and important ways in the document. It is not often institutions give themselves the opportunity to ask the big questions. What do we want to be, to become, pretty important stuff. Now how to translate this into strategic plans. Michelle Marks (Vice Provost for Academic Affairs) has kindly agreed to help him with the whole process. (Professor Marks provided a brief update at the [March 27th](#) Faculty Senate meeting.)

The next piece will be the revising the whole budgeting process. Universities are advised to do this every so often. How do we distribute funds between central administration and units? Is our current budget

system aligned in how we want to do things? Two groups are coming in, to select one to come up with one unique solution. A lengthy process, anticipate 18-24 months to analyze what we have and create an alternative, then run them in parallel for about a year to see if it works out. Sr. Vice President Davis added there will be opportunities for input, views it as a collaborative process. What do you like or not like about the current system? President Cabrera then opened the floor to questions.

A Senator recommended the use of metrics in the Strategic Plan as critical to measure our progress, and wants to see metrics as part of the Plan itself.

President Cabrera agreed. The plan will have to be translation of Strategic Vision into specific goals, to include how colleges and units contribute to goals.

A second Senator: Do you want to have all these plans in alignment? Does this violate a rule?

President Cabrera: Yes. He doesn't expect this to be a perfect process, cannot be a perfect alignment. The state will ask us for capital plan. We have to have an answer and will have to make informed guesses.

A third Senator: What percentage of funding in the university can be spent without restrictions?

President Cabrera: Different acronym for different types of processes. He wants to put decisions in hands of those with the most knowledge to make the best decisions. Not so much top down, but aligned in centers (e.g. deans to invest excess money for things to happen).

A fourth Senator: What is your opinion on the appropriate role of faculty to select a new Provost? How transparent should the process be?

President Cabrera: Given the philosophy above, faculty have significant and major involvement and faculty will have major presence on search committee. To make search as open as we can make it, to be realistic as we get to the end. He expressed his strong preference to have open meetings with finalist candidates. A fundamental aspect of Provost's role is to develop productive access with faculty; just in terms of seeing Provost in front of faculty is a terrific exercise. Let's be smart about how we do this. Strong preference to have open presentations.

A fifth Senator: Before you came, there was a lot of talk about cost-of-living increases for faculty and staff. What are you going to do?

President Cabrera: The latest estimate of faculty compensation is a little over 25% of peer group. Not good, need to close the gap and critical for future to attract and retain world class faculty members. He spent time in January and February in Richmond to make case/claim for this. He hopes the new budget process is more entrepreneurial, more revenues, sees faculty salaries as a priority and wants to find ways to make this happen.

A sixth Senator: Faculty are murmuring about the costs of move from the CAA to the Atlantic 10.

President Cabrera: Unfortunately when we told the CAA we were leaving, the CAA press release exaggerated implications of it. Basically, we paid \$1M exit fee from the CAA and then we have a \$3/4M entry fee into the Atlantic 10 Conference. Each conference has its own television deal, from no money from television stations; to having to pay money to get product out; to receiving money for product. The Atlantic 10 has regional television contracts. When teams get to the NCAA March tournament, the more games you play, the more money earned – money sent to conference which distributes it. We are in a conference which gets more revenue. Almost like an "external loan", expectation in five years to pay back cost. He added that this does not touch student fees.

A seventh Senator: When money comes back into the university from athletic contests, very little, if any, goes into academics. Can we dedicate some money for the provost to use?

President Cabrera: No, cannot do. To be competitive in a new league you have to make athletic investments. Other advantages are harder to quantify. Look at out-of-state recruitment. We know where they are coming from and where teams have brand awareness. We looked at this from many different angles.

A fourth Senator: Do you anticipate renaming of the Patriot Center?

President Cabrera: We are now recruiting for a new head of Development, Mark Broderick left and is now a financial advisor. We decided to unify position of President of the GMU Foundation with the chief development officer into one job. The first goal of the new person will be to plan the capital campaign – priorities include scholarships, research, faculty, everything.

III. New Business - Committee Reports

A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee – June Tangney, Chair

Update on BOV Response to Faculty Handbook Revisions: The Provost put together the peace summit with the BOV member, Suzanne Slayden, and I. We agreed to include the Chapter Two revisions at the May meeting, but to postpone the President search. They want to consider the reorganization of the Faculty Handbook, including individual sections and governance sections. Provost Stearns noted “Despite pretty careful efforts, we did not learn of concerns of BOV representative in advance at all. Unfortunate, trying to repair damage. Since we had the peace summit, President Cabrera had a conversation with Rector Clemente to make clear to the Board to articulate any concerns they have about the Faculty Handbook so that the administration can work on them with faculty. Given the Senate schedule, not to take up again until early fall.

A fourth Senator asked that the BOV not just look at reorganizing the Faculty Handbook, but also to have them identify parts which are “aspirational” and “non-aspirational”

Motion: To approve a request from the Provost to conduct annual faculty evaluations before the time specified in the Faculty Handbook.

From time to time it might be necessary to temporarily relax a requirement in the Faculty Handbook in order to satisfy an externally-generated requirement, especially if the requirement is one that benefits the institution. In the current case, the Commonwealth of Va. will be giving employees a mid-year raise that will be effective before the annual faculty evaluation is normally conducted. In order to qualify for this year's raise, the annual evaluation must be completed before the time as defined in the FH. The next annual evaluation will take place as defined in the FH. It is understood that this is not a permanent change.

From GMU Faculty Handbook:

Section 2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty

Faculty are evaluated annually by local unit administrators and/or committees of peers who report to the deans and directors or the Provost. The criteria for the annual faculty review are the same as those listed in Section 2.3.3 (Term Faculty) and Section 2.4 (Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty) except that the evaluation is based upon the contributions of the preceding academic year and, where applicable, the summer. Faculty are evaluated on the quality of their overall performance and in the context of their goals and assignments. The results of and rationale for the evaluation must be given to the faculty

member in writing; and faculty members must be afforded the opportunity to discuss the results of the evaluation.

Annual evaluations are the primary basis for determining salary increases (see Section 3.2). Local unit administrators may take into account performance evaluations over multiple years in making raise recommendations.

Discussion:

A second Senator spoke in favor of the motion and suggested not to declare anyone unsatisfactory in a truncated year.

A third Senator does not agree at all. Evaluations taken over a number of years, why is half a year so significant, why not last three years?

Chair Tangney: Concern about people who have been here for a short time. There are two different issues. Timing right now for this year a little bit earlier, ¾ year, not being asked to specify how raises determined, partially dictated by state, partially by dean.

Follow Up: Some faculty are away.

Chair Tangney observed that not all schools have communicated this.

Provost Stearns: The state budget was confirmed only a few days ago.

A fourth Senator: While he lauds concern, depth is not very deep. People hired at market rate in School of Management at higher (salaries) than those who have been here for a while. More urgent for those here for a long time, and not just at GMU.

Provost Stearns: Situations among faculty vary greatly. Some new faculty do not make much money at all, sees two years instead of one year quite fair. Two years to capture time frame for smaller increment.

An eighth Senator: Did we receive a raise or a bonus two years ago?

Provost Stearns: Two years ago there was a 2.4% raise.

A Senator: Not upset about trying to do this, but Faculty Handbook is an agreement between three parties – the faculty, the administration, and the BOV. Concerned this would in the future set a precedent.

Provost Stearns: We are asking for your permission. Retrograde awarded raises late in the year to save money, to adjust Faculty Handbook in the hopes state delivers more money sooner.

A sixth Senator: Concerned about those who plan according to traditional cycle.

Provost Stearns: He is always happy to hear Faculty Senate opinions, but its role is advisory. Chair Tangney noted that we are not deciding on how raises distributed, but to include this year.

A motion was made and seconded in favor of closing debate. The motion was approved unanimously. A vote on the motion was conducted by paper ballot. 26 votes in favor, 5 votes opposed, the motion was approved.

Annual Faculty Senate Evaluation of the President and Provost by Faculty Senate Standing Committees, University Standing Committees, and Ad Hoc Committees – See Attachment A.

Academic Policies- no report

Budget & Resources – Susan Trencher, Chair

I have discussed with Linda Harber ways to streamline procedures to obtain salary data. There will be a Budget Forum on Monday, April 15th with Provost Stearns and the new Senior VP J.J. Davis. We received over 200 responses in the first 48 hours to our email about summer school teaching. Some responses indicated it was fine, others not so, and encouraged faculty to continue to let us know.

Faculty Matters – Jim Sanford, Chair

Faculty Evaluation of Administrators: President Cabrera will not be evaluated this year as he is new. The Evaluation should be distributed next week and faculty will have 3-4 weeks to complete it. A Senator

noted that faculty are evaluated their first year here. Senator Sanford responded the basis historically used to be to distribute evaluations earlier in the year for the previous year. It has always been the case in the survey that deans and higher level administrators were not evaluated until the second year. Another Senator observed it is almost the end of the academic year. Senator Sanford reiterated that we are just following the policy/custom.

Nominations – Jim Bennett, Chair

We ask for unanimous consent to appoint Steven Weinberger (CHSS) to fill a position as Faculty Representative to a new university task force being formed on Privacy Issues. No objections were made to include this by unanimous consent. Can we have more than one Faculty Representative on the Task Force, as Zachary Schrag (CHSS) has chaired the Senate Task Force on Email and Computer Privacy Issues? We have benefitted greatly in the past from Faculty Senate representation. **The motion was approved.**

Organization & Operations – no report.

B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

Report from the Computer Email Privacy Task Force – Zachary Schrag, Chair

The Task Force has been working on this issue since December. Basically this is a challenge for all the university. We are moving to a new email system this month. We are trying to reconcile that with this report. Not a situation of administrators vs. faculty, but to wrestle with common problems. The report shares information with faculty – what the laws are, along with some recommendations for change. We received an email this morning with technical details of the new Office 365 system. The Faculty Senate and Staff Senate are working on alerting faculty and staff to privacy implications of the new system. There will be a record of everything in and out of your accounts for three years. He suggests employees take personal stuff out of these accounts. The full report is posted on the Faculty Senate website at http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/MINUTES_FS_2012-13/E-mail_and_research_privacy_report_final_2013-04-03.pdf

Walt Sevon, Executive Director, Technology Systems Division, reported the migration began a week ago and will continue into the next week. So far 1400 staff have been migrated. It will take a little more than a week for this to happen for the university. In response to a question raised, he confirmed that there is not an issue of losing emails, just may be in the wrong place, nothing will be lost.

A fourth Senator expressed concern about mid-April to mid-May as crunch time for faculty and students. Why not wait another month?

Mr. Sevon: As you know, we tried to do this at the beginning of March; this is the earliest we could do it again. If we go past this, would have to wait until after finals.

A second Senator noted we were told to move large attachments out of past emails.

Mr. Sevon: The system would not move attachments larger than 25 megabytes.

A seventh Senator finds this really mystifying. There needs to be sensitivity to faculty and class timing. This can be so disruptive to faculty and student life, and suggested this occur either between semesters or at the end of the spring semester.

IV. Other New Business

Request for Faculty Senate recommendation to Emeritus/Emerita rank

Attachment B

The request was approved.

David Roe, President, GMU Foundation

His presentation is posted on the Faculty Senate website at

http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/MINUTES_FS_2012-13/Faculty_Senate03_2013.pptx

He encouraged faculty to contact him with any questions at droe@gmu.edu. Chair Tangney thanked him and recognized his extraordinary service and expressed gratitude that he is staying with us.

V. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty – none

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

Respectfully submitted,
Meg Caniano
Faculty Senate clerk

ATTACHMENT A

Evaluation of the President and Provost by Faculty Senate Standing Committees, University Standing Committees, and Ad Hoc Committees AY 2012-13

responses compiled March 2013

Note that some committees did not provide responses to each 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: The President or Provost did not announce initiatives that fell specifically under the charge of our Academic Policies Committee. However, we did need to consult with the Provost's office regarding the proposed changes to the academic calendar for 2014-15 and 2015-16. The input was helpful to us in understand the impact of late start dates.

Budget and Resources: There has been discussion in various venues on campus about possible changes to the budget model under which the university has traditionally operated. No notice or information was provided to the Committee and no consultation has been sought. While clearly this decision is not under the aegis of the faculty, it has implications for funding, thus unit and programmatic implications throughout the university that are of import to faculty.

Faculty Matters: The President did not announce or act on any initiatives related to Faculty Matters. The Provost acted on two committee related issues, parental leave and criminal background checks. With regard to the former, the committee approved a parental leave motion in

AY 2011-2012, but the Provost announced that, while he supported the motion in principle, money was not included in the 2013 budget to fund it. Therefore, Senate action was postponed. This year the Provost announced that money had been included in the 2014 draft budget, and the Senate approved the motion contingent on funding. The committee appreciates the action of the Provost to proactively request funding. Regarding criminal background checks, without consulting the committee, the Provost and others in upper-level administration, along with representatives of Human Resources and Payroll, approved extending checks to all new hires and all faculty and staff changing positions within the university. The previous policy limited checks to targeted positions. The policy was changed in June, 2012, after the final Senate meeting of the year. Committee members and other Senators have very mixed opinions concerning the new policy, but we universally feel that a fuller discussion that included the committee should have occurred from the onset.

Organization and Operations: No, most of our issues surrounded allocation of queries to various committees, so no input was sought or needed from the President or Provost offices.

Responses from University Standing Committees and Ad Hoc Committees:

Academic Appeals: I was not contacted either by the President or by the Provost concerning initiatives or goals or acted upon issues that fall under the charge of my Committee.

Athletic Council: No, no initiatives or goals for the Athletic Council were initiated by the President or the Provost. We did not have any issues under my charge with either the President or the Provost.

Email and Research Privacy Task Force: Our task force was created in response to a previously announced initiative, so this question is not applicable to our work.

External Academic Relations: The External Relations Committee has had no interactions with the President or Provost, so we have nothing to report on that score.

Faculty Handbook Revision: The Provost's office has changes it would like to see implemented in the FH and the Provost's representative has brought these issues to the committee for joint discussion.

General Education: The Provost and I have regular conversations about general education. He is supportive of new initiatives, helping to fund a summer workshop for the gen ed committee, and a faculty team to attend the Gen Ed Assessment Conference held in Boston, February 28-March 2, 2013.

Grievance: The President or Provost has not announced any initiatives or goals, or acted upon issues that fall under the charge of the Grievance committee.

Minority and Diversity Issues: Attention to diversity and its importance have been cited by the new university president on several occasions as a high priority. One aspect of this is with the development of a new vision statement for the university. Another aspect was cited by Corey Jackson, Director of the Office of Equity and Diversity Services (now Vice President of Compliance, Diversity and Ethics); this was discussion about the creation of a new equity and diversity

workgroup or task force. Other than this awareness, no outreach to the MDIC or MDIC members has occurred. For each of these, it is valuable and positive that these are occurring; however, in their formulation, it would seem appropriate that an MDIC member would be included or consulted.

Non-Traditional, Interdisciplinary, and Adult Learning: Our committee has not actively engaged in any work this year and so I cannot respond to the survey in any meaningful way. It is the case that many of the new President's initiatives overlap with the committee's scope, but we have not - as a committee - been included on any of the planning.

Task Force to Examine Agreements Between GMU and Private Donors: Our Task Force re Donor Agreements has asked the Provost for information and asked him to meet with us. He has been responsive and helpful re both requests. Definitely no complaints on that score.

Technology Policy: The Technology Policy committee was consulted by Dr. Hughes regarding how best to survey faculty on technology needs---especially, regarding what areas could be caught in the cards became necessary. The Chair of the committee asked to represent faculty regarding the selection and adoption procedure for a new email system.

Writing Across the Curriculum: Not Applicable.

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: We have called on Janette Muir and Michelle Marks at various times throughout the academic year to consult about such items as the academic calendar, academic integrity policies, catalog changes regarding transfer credit, etc. They have always been quick to respond and their information extremely helpful to our committee.

Budget and Resources: The committee did not seek information or input directly from the Provost or President in this academic year.

Faculty Matters: In the process of revising questions on the Faculty Evaluation of Administrators Survey, a Faculty Matters Committee member requested information regarding the Provost's job description. A staff member in the Office of the Provost referred the committee member to the President's office. Staff members in this office were unable to provide this information but did send the committee member a copy of the advertisement that was distributed in the process of hiring the Provost. To get this information, contact had to be initiated by the committee member on several occasions.

Nominations: There was no interaction -- other than the Provost from occasionally naming his appointees to Committees/Task Forces, etc. And, there was no need for interaction.

Organization and Operations: No.

Reports from University Standing Committees and Ad Hoc Committees:

Academic Appeals: No, we did not seek information.

Athletic Council: No, the committee did not seek specific information from the President or the Provost. I meet with the President annually to provide information on the external oversight of the Intercollegiate Athletic Programs and my report on my work as the Faculty Athletic Representative.

Email and Research Privacy Task Force: We have had productive meetings with four university officials, all of whom were generous with their time and helpful and candid with their answers to our questions.

Faculty Handbook Revision: Yes. The FH committee regularly meets with a representative from the Provost's office to discuss FH issues of interest to both. All responses were adequate and timely.

General Education _As needed. Staff members always respond in a prompt, courteous manner.

Grievance: The Grievance committee did request information or input from the Provost with regards to a Grievance submitted in December 2012. The Provost did respond in a timely manner via phone and Email, albeit the response was unexpectedly brief and was generally defensive rather than collaborative.

Minority and Diversity Issues: The MDIC requested various information from Corey Jackson; this was information about the diversity of Mason's faculty, and was provided by Mr. Jackson and his office in a thorough, open and timely manner. The MDIC currently seeks engagement of this office with the hosting and development of a website with various resources and insights about diversity issues at Mason.

Technology Policy: Last academic year's annual report summarizes numerous interactions between the president's office and the committee. Dr. Joy Hughes attended all of our meetings and when necessary brought her directors and support staff when necessary.

Writing Across the Curriculum: The committee asked Jeanette Muir to meet with us to discuss how to best convey the importance of WAC to the new president. At our meeting she provided helpful suggestions on this matter.

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: Michelle Marks has asked that we send the monthly agenda to her, and she attends our meetings whenever possible.

Budget and Resources: A representative of the committee attends an administrative level discussion approximately once a month. Allocation of resources is not generally covered at these

meetings. There is an opportunity for increasing communication regarding allocation of resources in general terms as they affect faculty.

Faculty Matters: The Faculty Matters Committee should be included in discussions of major changes in university policies or of potential new policies from the outset, not after final determination has been made.

Organization and Operations: Communication channels and efforts seem adequate at this time.

Responses from University Standing Committees and Ad Hoc Committees:

Academic Appeals: No suggestions.

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

Email and Research Privacy Task Force: This question seems inapplicable to our ad hoc committee in its current form.

Faculty Handbook Revision: No suggestions for improvement.

General Education: No suggestions.

Grievance: The Grievance committee has only evaluated one grievance in the past several years (December 2012). In this case, the Provost was closely involved in the grievance, and seemed to take a defensive posture rather than being collaborative. We feel that it would therefore be more constructive for the Provost and the President to work more collaboratively with our committee. On Feb 27, 2013 the Grievance committee submitted a final report on this grievance to the President and Provost, and there has been no response to date. (March 8, 2013)

(In response to a question raised at the April 3rd Faculty Senate meeting to clarify the role of the Provost, it was noted that the grievance concerned a dean in which the recommendation was made directly to the President.)

Minority and Diversity Issues: The Diversity Statement prepared by the MDIC, and endorsed in 2010 by the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and Student Government, still remains relatively obscure on university websites. The statement is currently included on the Diversity at Mason webpage, and on the webpage of the Center for Teaching & Faculty Excellence. It does not appear on the website of the Office of Equity and Diversity, whether as a policy and/or as a resource.

Continued engagement by Mr. Jackson and/or his staff is most important for the collaborative nature of this committee's work. To enhance diversity and inclusion at Mason will require a significant concerted effort that incorporates best practices, acknowledgement of positive efforts, highlighting of minority faculty accomplishments, accountability for academic units in promoting diversity and inclusion, tips for faculty members on this issue, and more. The MDIC's commitment and vision can be helpful for the Office of Equity and Diversity Services, as well as Mason overall.

Technology Policy: The committee is currently satisfied with the interactions as they exist.

Writing Across the Curriculum: We are satisfied with the level of interaction that currently exists.

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

Responses from Senate Standing Committees:

Academic Policies: We are satisfied with the support we have received from the Provost's office and the staff.

Budget and Resources: In order of contact:

The President through the Senior Associate Provost, invited all members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to meet with and provide feedback on the finalist for the position of Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration.

The Committee sought input from the Interim Vice President for Research and Development. We received a timely response and an agreement to meet with the committee for an extended period, during which all questions from the committee were helpfully and cordially addressed

The Chair of the Committee sought information (via phone) from:

The Assistant Vice President/Chief Budget Office in the Office of Budget and Planning.

The resulting conversation was extraordinarily helpful and led to a meeting set up by the Assistant Vice President with the newly arrived Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, the Provost and two representatives from the Committee. A candid and useful conversation regarding the distribution of budget information to the Faculty Senate took place. Additionally, the Provost and Senior Vice President planned a budget forum open to all faculty before the end of the Spring semester

The above interactions between the Committee and/or its representatives were productive, cordial and fruitful.

Faculty Matters: The committee has no additional information regarding interactions with the President or Provost and their respective staffs.

Organization and Operations: None.

Responses from University Standing Committees and Ad Hoc Committees:

Academic Appeals: No additional information.

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.

Email and Research Privacy Task Force: In retrospect, we might have wished to learn earlier of the specifics of the new e-mail system in order to have had more time to prepare guidance. However, the problems we face are largely due to the technical and legal complexities of the issue, rather than any problems with university officials.

Faculty Handbook Revision: The FH Committee finds the administrative representatives who meet with the committee to be dedicated and knowledgeable in their areas. They have spent many hours in committee meetings this semester and their efforts have resulted in a much improved Faculty Handbook.

General Education: The Provost and President are eager to see some reform connect to general education, thus they are very supportive in helping to move this discussion forward.

Grievance: No additional information.

Minority and Diversity Issues: The MDIC is very pleased with Corey Jackson's commitment to this issue, and to his recent promotion to the position of Vice President. The committee looks forward to continued good collaboration with him and his office. The MDIC is also very pleased to see the public attention provided to diversity and inclusion issues by President Cabrera, with a focus on expanding significantly beyond the fact that "Mason has a diverse student body." Specifically, the MDIC seeks to have enhanced attention to diversity and inclusion issues among faculty and staff, including minority faculty as well as faculty overall. One suggestion is to convene a campus-wide town meeting sponsored by the offices of the Provost, Equity & Diversity, and Faculty Senate; this type of high profile initiative could help demonstrate a high commitment to diversity and inclusion.


ATTACHMENT B



College of Visual and Performing Arts
4400 University Drive, MS 4C1, Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Phone: 703-993-8877; Fax: 703-993-8883

MEMO

TO: Faculty Senate
June Tangney, Chair

From: William Reeder, Dean 
CVPA

DATE: March 22, 2013

RE: Request Senate permission for Emeritus Status
For Richard Kamenitzer

Professor Richard Kamenitzer is retiring this June and the College would like to bestow him with emeritus status as Director Emeritus of the Arts Management Program.

Richard came to higher education late in his career and was hired specifically for his management experience and his relationships in the arts management field. As such, we did not petition for tenure status. His appointment was Admin Faculty, Associate Professor. My understanding is that for such individuals, emeritus status requires Senate approval.

Richard served in the Arts Management Masters program from its creation, and for the past eight years was its Director. Under Richard's leadership, the program has become one of the finest of its kind – graduating over 250 students with effective student recruitment including a strong mix of students from China, Korea, Taiwan, Europe and others. Many of these students are now working in leading roles in regional and national arts institutions, including five current employees of Wolf Trap, four each at the Kennedy Center, Arena Stage and Woolly Mammoth, three at the Smithsonian and one at Lincoln Center.

Graduates have also found successful positions in higher education. Eight are now employed here at George Mason. Others are at institutions such as MIT and the New England Conservatory of Music. Two students have become founding faculty of new Arts Management programs at universities in China and Korea.

Equal to the success of students has been the effective recruitment of adjunct faculty from virtually every major cultural institution in the region. Mason's Arts Management Faculty is a virtual who's who of the arts leadership in the Washington Metro region. The directors of nine major cultural institutions teach courses in marketing, fundraising, board development, program management, and technical management. Not only have these esteemed colleagues become a fine faculty; they have been a priceless network for graduates.

Richard created a Board Member Institute, which is a training program for non-profit board members throughout the DC metropolitan region. Faculty members of the Institute include both arts management faculty and graduate students, who became mentors on a wide range of board initiatives.

From a service perspective, Professor Kamenitzer has served on a range of strategic planning committees within the College, is the treasurer of the Fairfax County Arts Council, past Chair of the Washington Stage Guild, and was a Board member of the Association of Arts Administration Educators. Globally, Richard was invited numerous times by the State Department to serve as a consultant to cultural initiatives in Africa and China. Most recently, he has provided services to the Beijing Conservatory of Music in helping it establish an Arts Management undergraduate major and the Swaziland Cultural Minister, seeking to develop new markets for artisans.

Richard will retire from Mason at the end of this term. The faculty of the Arts Management program and we in the College would like to recognize his contributions with Emeritus status.