I. Call to Order: Chair Keith Renshaw called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

II. Approval of the Minutes of November 7, 2018: The minutes were approved.

III. Announcements
Provost Wu began with remarks, noting that Rector Davis will also be in attendance. The Provost presented three updates.

1. Gift Review Activities follow up: The Provost will make a presentation to the BOV at its meeting next week (December 12, 2018). He will present a rough draft of policy recommendations based on the Review Committee’s recommendations. This will be open to comments from the faculty in the following weeks and months. There is agreement that it would be better to allow some time when people come back from the holiday break. During the presentation he will also outline 27 gift agreements
marked during the initial review for additional review and will provide a status report to BOV in terms of what has been done with those 27 marked agreements.

2. Some faculty have been engaged as part of a team with the administration in discussion around a possible online partnership in the past few months. No agreements/deals have been made, meaning there is no done deal. Faculty engagement will absolutely occur to bring the issue before the broader campus for conversation. He will also discuss this in his December blog.

3. Amazon agreement includes the intention to create a School of Computing; this is at the very early stages right now. There is a working group of faculty and deans to determine what this school will look like given computing is different when applied to different fields. This too will involve a campus-wide discussion.

Questions and discussion:
Senators asked questions around the form of faculty engagement with regards to any potential online partnership as well as the recent discussions with the VA legislature that led to enabling legislation for these kinds of agreements. The Provost agreed that faculty will be involved but could not commit to the actual structure of that involvement. He also noted that having a faculty vote is not precluded but a full campus-wide discussion must occur first before anything else can happen. Faculty members advocated strongly for faculty inclusion in discussion and a vote so that faculty have an actual say in the decision. The Provost noted that no deal has been made with any private partner and have not entered serious discussion with any potential partner.

Other questions for the Provost focused on the new School of Computing and whether the Academic Policies Committee would be given a proposal for this school as that is their purview. The Provost noted that there is no current proposal to share but that the committee will be involved early. Other senators were concerned about the expenditures for this new school, especially since there are programs in this area already on campus that would appreciate an outlay of funds. The Provost noted that the creation of the new School coincides with Amazon’s entrance into Northern Virginia; the state’s willingness to provide funding for this relocation may mean Mason is eligible for additional funds beyond what was committed in the capital match announced with the arrival of Amazon.

Rector Tom Davis and Vice Rector Jimmy Hazel arrived to the meeting. The Rector and Vice Rector presented information about the Faster Farther capital campaign, with a note that the university fundraising activity in all areas is higher than in previous years. The expectation is that the campaign should bring in almost $700M total.

The Rector then focused comments on the decision of Amazon to relocate to Northern Virginia, the impending draft of the Gift Acceptance Policy, and the online opportunities that may be in the future.

Senators questioned the Rector about the possible relationship between an online university and the rest of the university, asking about a possible firewall between them, tenure opportunities for faculty, admissions requirements, and faculty governance. Moreover, there were questions about whether this was even necessary or if it would be successful. There was substantial discussion about the importance and value of faculty
associated with any online university having the option of tenure and the need for faculty to vote on whether any online option should move forward. The Rector responded that Mason Korea was a good example of something like a separate entity, that there would be no need to change the brand and to reinvest funds in the university. He argued that faculty would maintain control of course content but since there was no agreement or possible agreement in the future there was no way he could discuss specific nuances as there was nothing to discuss. A faculty up or down vote will need to be the result of further discussions when there is something to discuss. However, the Rector affirmed the importance of faculty support for any online initiative to work because of the instrumental role of faculty in producing high quality education at the university.

Additional questions about the financial feasibility of an online university were posed to the Rector, who responded that the board was not interested in putting the university on the line if something goes wrong financially. The Provost and the Rector noted that the university could be an important player in providing access to a quality education for many people using an online format and that this would be a solution to a pressing social problem, though both acknowledged Senators’ concerns about true access and high-quality educational opportunities.

Other Senators asked about the Gift Acceptance Policy and the BOV willingness to make public all agreements. The Rector noted that there was continued concern although as a general rule that seemed appropriate. The BOV will look at the policy and determine if it will hurt the ability of the university to raise money with anonymous donors.

IV. Committee Reports  
A. Senate Standing Committees  
   Executive Committee – Keith Renshaw, Chair  
   Update on Institute for Humane Studies documents that were distributed to the Senate: Marilyn Smith’s office is working on question whether those (centers) to whom we provide a gmu domain email are subject to FOIA. Executive Committee has requested a comprehensive list of all domain names along with copies of their affiliation agreements, and will also discuss with Brian Walter, University Counsel.

   Academic Policies – Suzanne Slayden, Chair  
   Presented Summer Calendar 2019 for review.  
   No objections were made from the floor and the calendar was approved.

   Budget and Resources – Tim Leslie, Chair  
   FY 2018 College and School Revenues and Expenditures  
   Link to Report

   Faculty Matters – no report

   Nominations – no report
Organization and Operations – Lisa Billingham, Chair

Motion to change the name and charge of the Minority and Diversity Issues Committee

Background
The current charge of the Minority and Diversity Issues Committee is as follows:

To work in concert with the Office of Compliance, Diversity and Ethics and the Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Multicultural Education (ODIME), other pertinent administrators, and campus organizations in developing and implementing means to ensure nondiscrimination, inclusion, and protection of the rights of all persons affiliated with the University; and to facilitate dialogue among those connected with the University and those in the broader community on matters concerning marginalized populations and diversity issues.

During the 2017-2018 Academic Year, the Minority and Diversity Issues Committee concluded that this charge was not well-established. This decision was reached as the result of spending the entire academic year meeting with various organizations throughout the campus. It was further evident that there was redundancy in various campus organizations with but no clear vision for the Minority and Diversity Committee except on the periphery. As a result, it was recommended that the committee be dissolved or integrated into an already existing Senate committee.

During the summer (2018), administrative personnel and faculty meet to discuss diversity, equity, inclusion and well-being. As a result of this meeting, the Faculty Senate Minority and Diversity Issues Committee was assigned to review the name and charge of the existing committee and submit its recommendations to the Senate O&O Committee.

In the fall (2018), the committee membership was changed, and the first order of business was to review the existing name and charge of the committee. Reviewing the work of the former committee, it was unanimously decided that the concentration needed to be faculty. It was further identified that there are numerous organizations throughout the campus for students, but there was not a voice or support for minority faculty. It was further determined that the Office of Compliance, Diversity and Ethics would be the perfect partner for this revised name and charge change.

The revised name and charge that you see before you today were reached by consensus with the current members of the Minority and Diversity Issues Committee, and have been endorsed by Julian Williams, Rose Pascarell, and Kim Eby. All of these administrators have agreed to partner with the committee as it moves forward pending the approval of the name and charge change.

The Senate Minority and Diversity Issues Committee is asking for your support and endorsement of the name and charge change so that it can move forward with establishing a work plan for spring, 2019.
Motion
Therefore, the committee moves that:

1. The name of this committee be changed to the Faculty Equity and Inclusion Committee (FEIC).

2. The charge of this committee be changed to the following:
   Working with the Offices of the Provost, Faculty Affairs, and Office of Compliance, Diversity and Ethics to foster equity and inclusion among the faculty with the goal of improving recruitment, retention, and overall well-being of under-represented faculty members.

The motion was approved.

B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

  Effective Teaching Committee
  Results of Pilot Evaluation Form, Lorraine Valdez-Pierce

  **Effective Teaching Committee**
  Faculty Senate Meeting – Dec. 5, 2018

  **Summary Report**
  May 2018 Pilot Testing of Revised Course Evaluation Form

I. Selection of Participants

- 22 instructors of online courses
  - Recommended by Program or Dept. Chairs
  - No negative impact on evaluation or salary decisions
- 25 courses
- 384 students

II. Administration

- Online courses only
- Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness (OIRE)

III. Results

- May 2018 – Piloted course evaluation form
- June 27 & Aug. 31, 2018 – OIRE provided analysis results
- Aug. 2018 - Distributed survey to participating faculty on usefulness
- Sept 2018 – OIRE responded to request for additional information
- Response rates
- Factor analysis & item correlations
- Faculty Survey results
IV. Next Steps

- Draft policy recommendations for faculty evaluation
- Revise items, reduce number
- Examine reliability of Likert-scale vs. rating scale items
- Meet with new OIRE Director

Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee
Response to Internal Review Committee Report, Matt Karush

Response of the Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee to the
Provost’s Recommendations for New Gift Acceptance Policy

November 27, 2018

On May 2, 2018, the Faculty Senate passed two motions introduced by the Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee (ICOIC) after an extensive inquiry into the University’s gift acceptance policies. The first of these addressed the need for transparency by calling for all gift agreements to be published in a permanent online database for public review within 30 days of formal enactment. The second motion sought to increase faculty input over gift acceptance by adding two elected faculty representatives to the Gift Acceptance Committee (GAC) and charging those representatives with reporting to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate in the case of a gift accepted over their objections.

At the November 7 meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Provost presented the policy recommendations elaborated by the Internal Review Committee (IRC) tasked by the President with examining existing gift agreements. Although the Provost described these recommendations as in keeping with the spirit of the motions passed by the Senate, he acknowledged that they were not identical. He laid out a process whereby the Provost would present to the Board of Visitors on December 12 a set of specific policy recommendations based on the IRC’s more general recommendations. The Faculty Senate would then be asked to provide input. In the interest of shared governance, we believe that it is important for the faculty to contribute to the policy-making process at an earlier stage. In particular, we believe that the ICOIC can offer an informed faculty perspective as the President, Provost and Vice-President for Advancement develop the policy recommendations they intend to bring to the BOV. We offer the following suggestions in this spirit.

In general, we support the IRC’s policy recommendations, but we believe they should be strengthened as follows:
1) With regard to transparency, the IRC and the Provost have stated that any “associated conditions” connected to gifts (everything the University has committed to do) should be made public even in cases when the donor has been granted anonymity, and that the identity of all donors should be made known to the GAC, including its faculty representatives. We strongly support these measures. Additionally, the ICOIC believes that meaningful transparency requires that all gift agreements (including past agreements) be made public in a user-friendly searchable database. The database should include labeled agreements organized in a logical sequence. While we understand that, in the interest of expediency, a searchable database was not feasible for the initial release of agreements reviewed by the IRC, this should be the goal and will provide a consistent structure for the transparent communication of gift agreement terms moving forward.

2) We support the IRC’s suggestion that the GAC review any agreement that deviates from a standard template (p39). However, we have concerns about the process recommended by the IRC, based as it is on the concept of “escalation conditions” that would trigger “additional review” of specific gift agreements. This concept implies that some entity other than the GAC would be entrusted to determine whether each gift agreement merits review. Such a process would not be transparent. Should it be necessary to make the committee’s workload manageable, limiting review to gifts above a certain size (as specified in the faculty senate’s motion) would be preferable to a process that includes a secret initial vetting. To truly inspire trust in the new process, every significant gift agreement needs to be reviewed by the GAC (with the substantial faculty representation envisioned by the IRC).

3) By envisioning “additional review” of agreements that are escalated, the recommendations stop short of specifying what sorts of violations would be considered grounds for the rejection of a gift. A more effective policy would establish principles according to which agreements will be evaluated, rather than conditions that will trigger a review process. Adopting such principles would not impose a one-size-fits-all rubric on all gift agreements, since the GAC would still be charged with conducting a review in each case; it would merely define the principles that the University community agrees ought to be the basis of the GAC’s work. If the new policy does not establish such principles, it risks being perceived, perhaps rightly, as an arbitrary process vulnerable to pressure from powerful stakeholders.

Respectfully submitted by the faculty members of the ICOIC:

Matt Karush
Chris Kennedy
Dave Kuebrich
Bethany Letiecq
Lance Liotta

Chair Renshaw thanked Matt and the ICOIC Committee for its work. Provost Wu clarified it is the Gift Acceptance Committee’s intention they review each gift, not a separate new committee.
V. **New Business** – none.

VI. **Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty:** African Dance takes place next Thursday from 11:00 am – 1:00 p.m. in the deLaski Center for the Performing Arts Chair Renshaw wished everyone good luck and hopes you have a good break at the end of the semester.

VII. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 4:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Shannon N. Davis
Secretary
### Summer 2019 Calendar (updated 11/27/18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Session 1 12 weeks</th>
<th>Session A 5 weeks</th>
<th>Session B 8 weeks</th>
<th>Session C 5 weeks</th>
<th>Session D 10 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First day of classes</td>
<td>Mon May 20</td>
<td>Mon May 20</td>
<td>Mon Jun 3</td>
<td>Mon Jun 24</td>
<td>Mon May 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Day to Add</td>
<td>Tues May 28</td>
<td>Wed May 22</td>
<td>Thur Jun 6</td>
<td>Wed Jun 26</td>
<td>Fri May 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day (University closed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mon May 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Day to Drop</td>
<td>Tues Jun 18</td>
<td>Mon Jun 3</td>
<td>Thur Jun 20</td>
<td>Mon Jul 8</td>
<td>Thur Jun 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day (University closed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Recess (Classes do not meet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Jul 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation/Thesis Deadline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Aug 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Conferral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sat Aug 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Last day to for Selective Withdrawal is July 4th but the university is closed both the 4th and 5th, so the deadline is Monday, July 8th.
** Only two days of final exams because of a shortened calendar due to July 4th and 5th holiday.
*** Saturday final exam days have been added to accommodate Saturday classes.