

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
DRAFT MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
OCTOBER 4, 2017
Robinson Hall B113, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

Senators Present: Alan Abramson, Mark Addleson, Dominique Banville, Jim Bennett, Alok Berry, Lisa Billingham, Virginia Blair, Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Angel Cabrera, Carol Cleaveland, James Conant, Shannon Davis, Betsy DeMulder, Charlene Douglas, Christy Esposito-Smythers, David Gallay, Michael Gilmore, Jesse Guessford, Tamara Harvey, Dimitrios Ioannou, Bijan Jabbari, Aditya Johri, Rebecca Jones, Diana Karczmarczyk, Larry Kershberg, David Kravitz, David Kuebrich, Timothy Leslie, Bethany Letiecq, Daniel Menasce, Daniel Pilsby, Jeremy Rabkin, Keith Renshaw, Pierre Rodgers, Esperanza Roman-Mendoza, Catherine Sausville, Joe Scimecca, Solon Simmons, Suzanne Slayden, Susan Trencher, Girum Urgessa, Iosif Vaisman, Jenice View, Emily Vraga, Shelley Wong, S. David Wu, Masoud Yasai, Stanley Zoltek.

Senators Absent: Peggy Agouris, Kevin Avruch, Kenneth Ball, Deborah Boehm-Davis, Henry Butler, Julie Christensen, Rick Davis, Mark Ginsberg, Chris Kennedy, Germaine Louis, Kumar Mehta, Maury Peiperl, Karen Reedy, Mark Rozell, June Tangney, John Zenelis.

Visitors Present: Alexander Abel, Vice Chair, Diversity Committee, Student Government; LaShonda Anthony, Director, Academic Integrity; Eve Dauer, University Registrar; J.J. Davis, Sr. Vice President; Pat Donini, Assistant Vice President of Human Resources, Human Resources/Payroll; Kim Ford, Personnel Project Manager, Academic Administration, Provost Office; Gillian Lancaster, Associate Director/Chief Investigator, Compliance, Diversity and Ethics; Michelle Lim, Faculty Initiatives Manager, Human Resources/Payroll; Wendy Mann, Head, Data Services Group; Digital Programs & Systems, University Libraries; Gillian Lancaster, Associate Director and Chief Investigator, Compliance, Diversity, and Ethics; Linda Monson, Director, School of Music; Janette Muir, Associate Provost, Academic Initiatives and Services; Claudia Rector, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs; Shelley Reid, Director for Teaching Excellence, Stearns Center for Teaching and Learning; Michael Sandler, Director, Strategic Communications; Arujan Shari, Student Government; Peter Stearns, Provost Emeritus and University Professor; Bethany Usher, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, Preston Williams, Presidential Communications Manager, Strategic Communications; Elizabeth Woodley, University Ethics Officer and Policy Manager, FOIA Compliance Officer, Compliance, Diversity and Ethics;

I. Call to Order: Chair Keith Renshaw called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. He notes that Meg could not be at the meeting today; she requested a recording of the proceedings in order to transcribe the minutes of the meeting.

II. Approval of the Minutes of September 6, 2017: The minutes were approved.

III. Announcements

Chair Renshaw introduced President Angel Cabrera. He is here to answer questions but also to provide kudos. This year we have the largest and most diverse class in our history, highest academic level ever. We continue to report no disparity in outcomes by ethnic group, Pell Grant recipients. Our graduates beat every benchmark on default rates, both nationally and within the Commonwealth. It is also impressive how we are excelling and doing well in the national and international rankings.

We are delivering on our mission of access despite continuing to face declining public support. Capital appropriations are doing well; we can see some of those efforts in Peterson Hall and will see more when

Robinson is renovated. While we are doing well in capital appropriations we are not doing so well in terms of operating dollars. This has been a priority over the last few years and this year we are following a more aggressive strategy. We are putting all of our political capital to try to narrow the gap on what we are receiving on per student basis relative to peers. This is the top priority in this legislative session. Wanted to make sure there was time for comments and questions.

Senator: There have been amazing things happening at Mason and there are many things to be happy about right now. However, there was a recent announcement about a local university receiving money from foundations. What do we need to do to get access to those kinds of funds?

Cabrera: We are not the flagship and endowments tend to go to flagship universities. Trends are good for us as of right now. We have already reached our goal for our capital campaign early. We are raising twice as much money as when he arrived. The Foundation now provides more to the university than in the past and trends are good.

Senator: At the College CHSS meeting last week it was mentioned that the strategic plan was being looked at again. What is the faculty involvement in that process?

Cabrera: We are not redoing the strategic plan. We have to look at the plan but it is not changing overall. We are just looking at whether we are doing what we said we were going to do. Strongly believes that for strategic plans to be of any value, you have to look at them regularly. You have to test whether the assumptions were fair, you have to see whether the definition of some of the goal areas continue to be valid. That is what is happening, we are getting committees to look at some areas and to provide critical review. There is a faculty member on each working group and Chair Renshaw is working on the synthesizing group. Thanks to all who are engaged in the process. The goal is to check but not redo the entire the plan. Take the part of our goal from the research side, which was to achieve Research I status. That has been accomplished, so now we need to decide what is the next goal, it's to stay Research I. That in itself is going to be a lot of work.

Senator: When Provost Wu and Senior Vice President JJ Davis gave the update on budget and lab dues, they were noting that the next day they were going to Richmond to ask for more about Bull Run Hall extension? Where is that going?

Cabrera: It's going. We had the funds to do an extension of Bull Run Hall for a different purpose. We desperately need some room for some of our science and engineering programs. The engineering program is the fastest growing unit on campus and requires huge space we don't have and the only place we can move it is the space in SciTech. The funds were given but for different purpose. We need approvals for the funds to be used for something other than what was planned (a library).

JJ Davis: We will have an update in December.

Senator: Is it possible if the faculty representatives on the strategic plan committees be elected by the Faculty Senate?

Chair Renshaw: They were, last month.

Senator: Good.

Cabrera: Let me thank you again for the incredible amount of work gets done at the university and is doing. As your frequent representative I get a lot of kudos from people who look at Mason and are really amazed at the work that gets done. A terrific year to look forward to. Thank you for having me.

Provost Wu: So given that the president had the floor and he seems to be very happy, I am going to yield my time, I know there is a lot on the agenda.

Chair Renshaw: Two reminders: First the Faculty Senate reception tomorrow at the Mathy House with President Cabrera, everybody must RSVP for this, just keep that in mind, it'll be over there tomorrow evening. One other reminder that isn't on the agenda, remember Rector Davis will be here in November at our meeting to start things off.

IV: Committee Reports

A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee – Keith Renshaw, Chair

We are addressing a few issues. We will bring forward the defunct IP committee we are starting to solicit interest on. We'll work with that policy to figure out what that should look like. We'll bring nominees on that in the future. We will bring forward other issues as time allows. Our next meeting is in the next two weeks. If you have business you want us to take up at the Exec meeting, please email me (krenshaw@gmu.edu) or Meg (facsen@gmu.edu).

Academic Policies – Suzanne Slayden, Chair

Attachment A

Academic Policies Committee

Faculty Senate meeting, Oct. 4, 2017

Repeating Courses and Termination from the Major Policies

Part I

Introduction: Courses often have “repeat limits” that specify a maximum number of times a student can repeat a course. Recently, some units have attempted to put “repeat limits” on courses, but have been informed that they cannot do so unless they also have a policy in place for “Termination from the Major.” As the Academic Policies Committee was not aware of this restriction, the committee considered **the issue of whether an academic program can impose a limit on the number of times a student can repeat a given course, without also having in place a policy for Termination from the Major.**

Background: A summary of previous Faculty Senate consideration of these two policies, “Repeating a Course AP 1.3.4” and “Termination from the Major AP 5.2.4” (with links to the original documents), as well as current relevant practices, is presented on the final page of this document.

Conclusion: The Academic Policies Committee concluded that **existing university academic policy does not require a program to have a Termination of the Major policy in place in order to limit repeats of certain courses.**

Part II

After reviewing the two policies, the AP Committee proposes revisions to correct unclear language and omissions, that include:

1) **Due process language in the Termination from the Major policy.** It is indeed sensible for a program to link these two policies when the courses with repeat limits are taken only or predominantly by their major students. It is necessary that both the Termination from the Major policy and the procedure for appeal be published.

and

2) **Provision for extending the repeat limit for a student.** There are several units in the University that teach courses to many students who are not their majors, and those students may repeat these courses excessively. So, while the units can impose repeat limits in the absence of a Termination from the Major policy, as stated in Part I, new language is proposed that clarifies this point and that allows consultation between the program offering the course, the student's major program and the student so that a student can repeat a course beyond the stated limit.

The proposed revisions are shown on the next three pages.

MOTION

- The Academic Policies Committee **moves** that the Repeating a Course policy and the Termination from the Major policy be revised as shown and that the policy revisions be effective immediately upon approval.

Reorganized, but essentially unchanged, text is shown in *italics*. Deleted words from the current policy are shown in ~~striketrough~~. New language suggested for the revised policy is shown in **bold**.

Policy in the 2017-2018 Catalog AP.5.2.4 Termination from the Major

Undergraduate students in any retention category may be reviewed for possible termination by their dean. Termination from a major—or from all majors in a college—may be imposed as a result of excessive repeating of required courses without achieving the minimum standard, and for other evidence of continued failure to make adequate progress toward completion of the major. Students must be informed a semester in advance and given a chance to meet the standard or appeal. Once a termination decision has been made, a letter of termination is sent to the student by the dean ~~or director of the school, college, or institute~~, and notification of termination from the major is affixed to the student's academic record. Students who are terminated are no longer eligible to pursue that major, but may ~~transfer to~~ a different major within the university to complete their undergraduate degree.

Suggested Revision AP 5.2.4 Termination from the Major

Undergraduate students in any retention category may be reviewed for possible termination from the major by their dean **according to the published policy approved by the major program**. Termination from the major—or from all majors in a college—may be imposed as a result of excessive repeating of required courses without achieving a minimum standard, and for other evidence of continued failure to make adequate progress toward completion of the major. Students must be informed a semester in advance and given a chance to meet the standard or to appeal **according to published college procedures**. Once a termination decision has been made, a letter of termination is sent to the student by the dean, and notification of termination from the major is affixed to the student's academic record. Students who are terminated are no longer eligible to pursue that major, but may **declare** a different major within the university to complete their undergraduate degree.

[Notes: There must be due process for students before being terminated. Major programs and colleges must have a previously-published policy on termination to initiate the process.]

Policy in the 2017-18 Catalog

AP.1.3.4 Repeating a Course

Effective July 1, 2011 Federal Regulations no longer allow federal student aid funds to apply to courses that a student has already taken twice with a passing grade. This limitation does not include courses that are "repeatable for credit," as described below. Students should contact the Office of Student Financial Aid to determine how repeated course work would affect their financial aid eligibility.

Some courses are annotated in the catalog as "repeatable for credit." These are courses which students may repeat and receive additional credit for each time the course is taken. The maximum number of credits is specified in each course's description. Special topics and independent study courses are examples. For all other courses, the following conditions apply:

- Graduate students who have ~~passed a course with~~ a satisfactory grade are not permitted to repeat the course for replacement credit. Grades of B- are considered satisfactory, unless the academic program specifies a higher minimum satisfactory grade. Students must obtain permission from their academic program to repeat a course in which they have earned an unsatisfactory grade. Each unit establishes procedures for granting such permission. Duplicate credit is not earned. When a course is repeated, all credits attempted are used to determine warning, termination, or dismissal; the transcript shows grades for all courses attempted; and only one grade per course may be presented on the degree application.
- ~~Some courses, such as special topics courses, are repeatable for a limited number of additional credits.~~ *As long as students do not exceed the maximum allowable credits for repeatable courses, all takings of the course count for credit and in the student's GPA. In cases where the student has exceeded allowable credits in a repeatable class, the transcript will exclude the grade and credits of the earliest taking of the class.*

(cont'd)

Suggested revision:

AP.1.3.4 Repeating a Course

Effective July 1, 2011 Federal Regulations no longer allow federal student aid funds to apply to courses that a student has already taken twice with a passing grade. This limitation does not include courses that are "repeatable for credit," as described below. Students should contact the Office of Student Financial Aid to determine how repeated course work would affect their financial aid eligibility.

- Some courses are annotated in the catalog as "repeatable for credit." These are courses which students may repeat and receive additional credit for each time the course is taken. The maximum number of credits is specified in each course's description. Special topics and independent study courses are examples. As long as students do not exceed the maximum allowable credits for repeatable courses, all takings of the course count for credit and in **calculation of the student's GPA**. In cases where the student has exceeded allowable credits in a repeatable class, the transcript will exclude the grade and credits of the earliest taking of the class.*
- Graduate students who have **earned a satisfactory grade in a course that is not repeatable for credit** are not permitted to repeat the course for replacement credit. Grades of B- are considered satisfactory unless the academic program specifies a higher minimum satisfactory grade. Students must obtain permission from their academic program to repeat a course in which they have earned an unsatisfactory grade. Each unit establishes procedures for granting such permission. Duplicate credit is not earned. When a course is repeated, all credits attempted are used to determine warning, termination, or dismissal; the transcript shows grades for all courses attempted; and only one grade per course may be presented on the degree application.

(cont'd)

□ For undergraduate classes not repeatable for credit, undergraduate degree students may repeat courses for which they seek a higher grade. *Academic programs may restrict repeats of certain departmental or college courses in the major. Excessive repeats may result in termination from the major by a student's dean.* A grade received in a repeated course will replace the grade ~~in a prior takings of the same course~~ in the calculation of the cumulative GPA, even if the more recent grade is lower. Duplicate credit is not given. ~~Repeat rules apply to taking the same course and courses designated in the catalog as equivalent. Repeat rules apply throughout a student's academic history.~~ All instances of courses and their grades remain part of the student's transcript. No adjustment to the cumulative GPA will be made when the grade in the repeated course is W. A grade in a Mason course will not be excluded from the cumulative GPA based on a subsequent taking of an equivalent course via study elsewhere. The exclusion of earlier grades of repeated courses will not change the academic standing or dean's list notations for the earlier semester. ~~Note that individual programs may disallow students from retaking certain high-demand courses simply for the purpose of improving their grade. Programs may also require departmental permission for students to repeat certain department, school, or college courses.~~

□ For undergraduate classes not repeatable for credit, undergraduate degree students may repeat courses for which they seek a higher grade. **This policy applies only to repeating** the same course, or courses that are designated in the catalog as equivalent. **The** grade received in a repeated course will replace the **earlier** grade in the calculation of the cumulative GPA, even if the more recent grade is lower. No adjustment to the cumulative GPA will be made when the grade in the repeated course is W. A grade in a Mason course will not be excluded from the cumulative GPA based on a subsequent taking of an equivalent course via study elsewhere. Duplicate credit is not earned. All instances of courses and their grades remain part of the student's transcript. The exclusion of earlier grades of repeated courses will not change the academic standing or dean's list notations for the earlier semester.

*Academic programs may disallow students from repeating certain high-demand courses simply for the purpose of improving a **satisfactory** grade. **Academic programs may restrict repeats of certain courses by all students. However, a student who is not a major in the program may be given permission to repeat a course beyond the limit after consultation between the academic program and the student's major program.** Academic programs may restrict repeats of certain courses by students in their major. Excessive repeats may result in termination from the major.*(See AP 5.2.4 Termination from the Major.)

[Note: The rules for Study Elsewhere exclude taking courses that have already been attempted at Mason.]

Summary of “Repeating a Course” and “Termination from the Major” Policies

In **Spring 2004**, when the university changed to a GPA-based grading system, a course repeat policy principle was approved by the Faculty Senate [*FS Minutes Jan. 21, 2004*]. The policy appeared in the 2004-2005 University Catalog, p. 31.

The policy allowed unlimited attempts by students to improve a grade, but specifically says "*Despite the preceding policy, individual programs may disallow students from retaking certain high demand courses simply for the purpose of improving their grade.*" This is the first instance of restricting course repeats.

In **Spring, 2009**, the Faculty Senate approved a Termination from the Major policy and added two new statements to the Repeating a Course policy that further allowed programs to restrict course repeats [*FS Minutes Mar. 4, 2009*]. These are the two statements:

"Different academic programs may restrict repeats of certain departmental or college courses in the major. Excessive repeats may result in termination from the major by a student's dean."

"Programs may also require departmental permission for students to repeat certain department, school or college courses."

The statements made by the Chair of the Academic Policies Committee at the Faculty Senate meeting included these: "Individual units currently have the capacity to limit the amount of repeats for specific courses." and "After due consideration, the Committee decided not to impose a limit on the number of times a student could repeat a course but rather to leave this decision to the local academic units."

-
- Currently, there is at least one program that limits course repeats for all students, consistent with the second statement incorporated in 2009 as shown in the Catalog under Computer Science for repeating courses in VSE ("*Students may attempt an undergraduate course taught by the Volgenau School of Engineering twice. A third attempt requires approval of the department offering the course.*"). Note that this statement is distinct from their policy limiting course repeats for major students and that is linked to their Termination of the Major policy.

Slayden: The committee report and motion concern the Repeating a Course policy and the Termination from the Major policy Background information and explanations appear on the agenda.

The Academic Policies Committee concludes there is no requirement that a unit have a Termination from the Major policy in place before limiting the number of times a student may repeat a course within the unit's program.

Discussion:

Senator: Who made this come forward?

Slayden: The Registrar's staff did not want to flip the switch (that is the technical language used by the Registrar's office) on some courses that had been approved for limiting repeats. And there is some ambiguity about what is happening in the Undergraduate Council in holding up these courses.

Senator, following up: Why is the Registrar's Office dictating academic policy?

Slayden: They have refused to flip the switch on repeating courses without a Termination policy in place. The committee is here today to address this issue.

Senator: Conceptually there is a relationship. If a major requires a particular course, a person who fails it cannot take it again, they have (by default) been removed from the major, correct?

Slayden: The issue not so much what academic unit does with courses they require or limit for the major. The issue has, and is probably not an issue, has been on limiting courses, limiting students who keep repeating courses in high demand, like lab courses where there are a certain number of seats available every semester. The real issue is for the big service courses like math, chemistry. There are a number of students who are repeating courses twice, three times, four times, and we would like to catch these people, to net those people to find out what is causing them to have excessive repeats and see if we can help them. But the language in the 2009 proposal it is not clear opposing language to clarify this. It allows the departments to say you can only repeat this course so many times. It's different from termination from major, clearly those students taking service courses are not all majors, they're taking it for their major. There's no clear relationship at all between limiting termination from major in math and all the students taking math who are not math majors, for example.

Chair Renshaw: There could be a link but Academic Policies was suggesting there does not have to be.

Senator: Courses across units are very different so these kinds of decisions need to be in the unit. Would not want to see anyone else have the ability to affect the specific unit.

Slayden: That is consistent with the current proposed language. Look at the Motion as in the appendix.

Senator: Are colleges' policies published or would this require colleges to publish?

Slayden: They would not need to have a new policy if they have a policy on terminology of a major.

Senator: What about students taking classes outside of their major?

Slayden: This is what the document is meant to address. How do we identify students who are having difficulty so we can assist them? Noting the students taking courses multiple times is not helpful. We need to identify students in the interest of our 6 year graduation goal. We can get these students out in 6 years if we identify them. Right now we are not identifying students who are repeating.

Senator: There is concern about the language of “effective immediately” because this policy is not indicated in the catalog. How do we know that students know this will be in effect?

Slayden: There are courses being held up right now that need to get into the catalog because of this presumed linkage between termination of the major and repeat policy, and that’s the reason for making it effective immediately. We want to get those repeats into registrar’s flip switch category and into the catalog with those repeats so we can get those courses out of the undergraduate council and out of the registrar’s stop list.

Senator: Is it possible to use italics and bold rather than color in the presentation of information for the future in order for the online materials to be more accessible?

Slayden: Yes.

A vote is called on the motion as moved by the committee. The motion passes.

Budget and Resources – Tim Leslie, Chair
No report.

Faculty Matters – Alan Abramson, Chair

Attachment B

This year, in response to requests from faculty and some other stakeholders (e.g., some deans) the Faculty Matters Committee will be reviewing current practice regarding faculty evaluation of administrators and department chairs. To inform this review, the committee invites input from Faculty Senators on these issues as described below.

Faculty Evaluation of University Administrators

As mandated in the Faculty Handbook, the Faculty Matters Committee currently organizes an annual survey of faculty regarding their evaluation of the President, Provost, and Deans. Each faculty member can complete the evaluation survey for the President, Provost, and the Dean of their home School/College. Survey results are made available to the university’s Board of Visitors, administrators, and all faculty.

One common concern expressed about the faculty evaluation of administrators is that it is unclear what impact, if any, the annual faculty survey is having. We seek input on the following questions:

- Do you feel the current process for faculty evaluation of administrators is working well or should be revised?
- If you feel the process should be revised, what changes would you suggest making?

Faculty Evaluation of Department Chairs

As far as the Faculty Matters Committee can tell, faculty evaluation of department chairs varies greatly across the university, with faculty in some departments conducting an annual review of their chair and faculty in other departments doing little or nothing in the way of evaluation of the chair.

We seek input on the following questions:

- What is current practice in your department regarding faculty evaluation of the department chair?
- What practices, if any, would you like to see in place for faculty evaluation of department chairs?

Discussion:

The committee is bringing forward an early discussion of two issues in order to use the deliberative nature of the body to comment on an issue before presented as a proposal. The two issues are faculty evaluations of administrators and faculty evaluations of department chairs. See Appendix B for specific details on request for deliberation.

Faculty Evaluation of Administrators: Faculty Matters coordinates the evaluation of administrators. The reports are available online and in paper and is presented to the Board of Visitors, President, Provost, and all Deans. Faculty Matters is asking the Faculty Senate for comments on the value of doing this kind of survey and producing the report, with a specific focus on how to do differently.

Senator: Some questions are about things the faculty don't have information about. Can those being evaluated provide a narrative and information?

Abramson: Provost has said the report gets some general use. Deans have said they want a chance to present their case to the faculty. This is done now, in that we put the administrator narrative online and ask that people look at it before the survey. This seems like messaging needs to be better. We need to set criteria for what we get from the deans to ask them to report the same information.

Senator: In some ways this is a non-issue, so the bigger thing is who cares about these reports? If they are not a serious part of the evaluations of deans, then what is to be done? This is connected to the larger problem of faculty disengagement with the institution. Faculty responses are not taken seriously because response rate is low. The broader question is about faculty engagement in the institution. It is our job as senators to encourage people to participate.

Senator: Is there a possibility that a policy be put in place that then the administrative person have to respond to the problems that are identified in the report? Can we ask that those folks provide a response? What is the value of the survey? This is connected to who responds. A number of people have no connection with the Provost and the President. If we have reasonable questions, keep the instrument the same.

Senator: Could there be more written comments? The current response rate is 30 or so %. Surveys are useful.

Senator: Does the board provide a statement to the faculty indicating the faculty assessment? Can this trickle down sharing of information happen so the report is useful? It is possible that people don't respond because they know nothing happens. Really asking to see if faculty can have a response given to the evaluation.

Senator: Suggest we keep what we have as we may need it. Committees also send a report on how they work with administrators. That was seen as useful.

Abramson: What about the department chairs and their reports to Faculty Matters committee on how the dean performed? One option is to replace the survey with committee interviews. Is the survey the best vehicle? Evaluation criteria that matter within the university are from those above rather than from the faculty. Our job is to provide voice of shared governance in the institution. The current report is not set up to be used. So what is it supposed to do? How might it be used? If there are additional thoughts, email Alan.

The second issue is the faculty evaluation of department chairs. This practice varies across units. The committee is interested in comments on current practice, what should if anything be done on this issue? There is no systematic practice of evaluating division/program directors either. If deans are not asking for evaluations from faculty then they are being evaluated by deans on other criteria that has nothing to do with faculty (same on provost/deans). What is the purpose of these and what do we want? Should we have in the faculty handbook that there should be an annual review of chairs by faculty? There is a sense that faculty do not know what the criteria there are for evaluating the chairs. Is there something that can be shared about best practices of faculty evaluation of department chairs across campus? What is the role of the chair vis a vis the dean's wishes and faculty's wishes? Note that contracts vary across units and across time. Should we see contracts of chairs as faculty senators? Should they be public documents (without names and \$)? If there are additional thoughts, email Alan.

If have thoughts about using time during the Faculty Senate meeting to discuss topics like this and in this manner, email Keith.

Nominations – Mark Addleson, Chair
No report.

Organization and Operations- Lisa Billingham, Chair

Report next month.

B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

The Technology Policy Committee reminds everyone that over the period of December 22-30 Blackboard will not be available because the university is moving to the cloud version. The Committee reminded us that the university is trying to walk a fine line on restricting email but are paying close attention to what is happening with email due to the many phishing attempts. If someone has technology problems, email Stanley Zoltek so the committee has items to work on. It was noted that IT Services really is trying to help faculty and comes to all of the committee meetings.

Chair Renshaw noted that there was ongoing work in other committees.

V. New Business: Nothing from the floor.

VI. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty.

Mason Club lost money last year and is continuing to lose money and is doing what they can to bring people in. Changes in pricing for Mondays to be \$10 like Fridays. The Club will close if people don't go. This was big experiment and if it doesn't work it won't come back.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Shannon N. Davis
Secretary