I. Call to Order: Chair Keith Renshaw called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

II. Approval of the Minutes of April 3, 2019: The minutes were approved.

III. Announcements

Chair Keith Renshaw welcomed Rector Davis and Provost Wu to the meeting.
Rector Davis noted it has a good year, and he opened the floor to for questions.

A Senator asked about the Board’s thoughts regarding the challenges and opportunities ahead connected to the arrival of Amazon HQ2. The Rector noted that the Board saw many opportunities but they were not happy about the legislation that favored Virginia Tech. Amazon HQ2 is a great opportunity for the Arlington campus over a twenty-year period. The BOV is excited about it and has broad contacts within the technology community and Amazon as well that can be strengthened around this.

The Rector was asked to provide examples of what he saw as excellent research, especially that of students, coming out of the university. The Rector said he did not have a list at that moment but would come back to the Senate with specific examples. [Note: the Rector sent an email to Faculty Senators May 7th named “Faculty Senate Message Attachment” that listed a number of projects the Rector and Board saw as research highlights.]

Several Senators asked generally around fundraising, comparing the Faster Farther campaign relative to the endowment. The Rector reported that most donations were actually earmarked. Some were earmarked for naming rights by deans, for example. Individual deans raise money for their schools, some are more successful than others. There is a lot of pressure on deans to raise money. In total, there were 73,000 individual donors: Research received $362M, Facilities $32.5M, $93M in scholarship money. The Rector noted that the endowment has doubled since he came to campus, and Provost Wu reported that the endowment sits at $150M currently. The Rector also noted that relative to other Virginia schools we are younger and have fewer alumni, plus our alumni giving is low relative to other schools. We are not where we want to be with the endowment, but we are going in the right direction.

Several Senators mentioned student concerns about the hiring of Justice Kavanaugh (at the Law School) as an adjunct faculty member. Given that faculty have the right to hire who they want, Senators asked the Rector’s position on how to encourage diversity of thought or whether to encourage other Justices (Kagan and Sotomayor were mentioned) to also teach for the university. Senators also asked for advice on how to talk with prospective students who cite this hire as a reason not to attend or alumni who cite it as a reason not to donate to the university.

Rector Davis reiterated that the faculty have control over who is hired and the last thing anyone wants is the BOV involved in that process. The idea of a university is that there is a diversity of thought with a broad breadth of views expressed in an academic atmosphere. The Board sees the benefits to the Law School of this hire; in some ways this is the Dean doing what he has been asked to do. The Deans are asked to do a lot of the fundraising and this may be one way for the Law School to secure additional funds for themselves. Protest is an appropriate form of response when done in a respectful manner, so if prospective students or alumni are concerned then start a discussion about their concerns.

Rector Davis noted the BOV is interested in expanding online opportunities for students, as this provides a chance for distance learning for veterans and other adults who want to return to school. The Board wants the faculty to be involved in this process, whatever it
may be. There have not been any decisions made with many discussions still ongoing about options, including the ones the Provost held on campus. Faculty expressed concerns about the implications for tenured faculty and the faculty’s overall ability to control curriculum as well as potential predatory practices that fully online universities have been found to use to increase enrollment. Rector Davis noted that he could not imagine upsetting the apple cart of tenure despite the fact that no specific decisions had been made about any final version of how to expand online. The Rector agreed that any online expansion must maintain the importance of the reputation of Mason. We would need to be able to control admissions, marketing, and curriculum. There would be the opportunity for faculty to participate; it would not be turned over to a new faculty. The Board is not ready to move forward as more discussion is needed.

Provost Wu added that any separate entity would have to be separately accredited by SACS. That entity could have a mix of faculty like we do now (tenured, tenure-track, term, and adjunct), but with a different proportion, there is no reason to believe that the faculty would not include tenure-track faculty. One model being examined is an extension campus model, such as the George Washington University College of Professional Studies or the Harvard University Extension School.

A Senator questioned the Rector about the strength of Mason’s brand in the marketplace, noting that other schools use athletics to increase branding as well as to build student culture. The Rector agreed that athletics has the opportunity to increase brand awareness, as the men’s basketball teams run to the Final Four did increase the number of applications to the university. He stressed that the university is not likely to undertake a football program due to the cost. Basketball can provide those opportunities for the university but also for the students as a number of alumni have jobs in the field. Mason’s baseball and women’s basketball programs (as well as other programs) have the same potential.

The Rector thanked Faculty Senate and yielded the floor to the Provost.

Provost Wu spoke briefly about the need for ongoing discussions regarding how Mason will engage in the online education space. After mentioning his blog (where he provided his ideas of criteria that must be met before moving forward), reflected on the vigorous debate that occurred in the spring semester, to include specific listening sessions and town halls. He introduced the members of the Task Force to address implementation of the Gift Acceptance Policy who had met three times and have a report for the Faculty Senate later in the meeting.

One senator thanked Provost Wu for the efforts he made to engage faculty in discussion of online initiatives.

IV. Special Orders
   Election of Faculty Senate Chair 2019-20
   Nominations were made from the floor with each candidate given a chance to speak. Keith Renshaw was nominated but noted he is not allowed to serve again. Shannon Davis was nominated and the nomination was seconded. Bethany Letiecq was nominated and the nomination was seconded. Letiecq stated that she will be on
study leave in spring semester 2020 and would not be available to serve for the year. Nominations were closed.

A voice vote was cast and Shannon Davis was elected Chair of the Faculty Senate for 2019-20. Due to recent by-law changes, her term begins the day after Commencement.

V. Committee Reports
A. Senate Standing Committees
   Executive Committee – Keith Renshaw, Chair
   The draft is nearly finished on centers’ use of institutional email servers. The committee awaits the final review from the University Auditors office, an essential piece to complete the report. The report will be sent out once it is complete.

   Academic Policies
   Link to annual report

   Budget and Resources – Tim Leslie, Chair
   Link to annual report
   The Chair reported a busy year getting data on attrition and the budget model. The committee obtained the full revenue information by college after a FOIA request and are anxious to share. However, they are reluctant to do so without administrative context. They look forward to assembling this context and posting data in the Fall.

   Faculty Matters
   Link to annual report

   Nominations – Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Chair
   Link to annual report
   Four faculty representatives were elected to serve on Board of Visitors:
   Keith Renshaw (CHSS) – APDUC Committee
   Christopher Kennedy (COS) – Development Committee
   Mohan Venigalla (VSE) Facilities and Land Use Committee
   Andrew Novak (CHSS) Research Committee

   Organization and Operations – Lisa Billingham, Chair
   Link to annual report
   There is one clarification regarding call for Faculty Liaisons for Fall: There are a few final details to coordinate with Human Resources. The committee anticipates getting them in time for training and anticipate sending the call out soon.

B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives
   Chair Renshaw asked for a change of order. No objections were made.

   Gift Acceptance Policy Implementation Task Force – Provost Wu

   The members of the Task Force (Provost Wu, Betsy DeMulder (CEHD), Trishana Bowden (Vice President, Advancement and Alumni Relations/President GMU Foundation), Kathleen Diemer, Associate Vice President, Advancement Relations; Bethany Letiecq (CEHD), and Keith Renshaw (CHSS)) met three times. The work has just been finished, with the entire task force in agreement on the purpose and
ultimate outcomes of their work. The Provost will provide the updated report for review by the BOV and then for the entire university community.

Discussion: Will the annual report to the Faculty Senate include how much money was turned down?
The task force asked for patience to be able to present the details of the process, although it is not intended to be onerous. One member of the task force noted that this policy will increase transparency tenfold because all gift acceptance agreements and letters of intent to be published and available for all. Gift Agreements will be subject to FOIA.

Effective Teaching Committee – Lorraine Valdez Pierce, Chair
A year ago, a revised Course Evaluation Form was piloted. Based on suggestions from OIRE (Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness), it was sent only to a small number of online courses. After analysis of those findings the committee has further revised the form. The next step would be to pilot the revised form with face to face and online courses.

Student Evaluation of Teaching Draft Form Revision

Discussion:
Several Senators expressed appreciation for all the hard work put into the form. Other Senators asked questions about access to individual student data via Banner or course information that could be pulled in from other sources in order to reduce the length of the form. There was great concern that the form was too long and that students would not complete it. There was additional concern raised by Senators that students may not have the knowledge to complete all of the items as written or that their interpretation of the items (i.e., “difficult class” may mean something different to students than to faculty). Several Senators noted that the instrument seemed aimed at small classes with seminar style teaching modalities in rooms where the physical space can be modified rather than technical courses and/or large lecture style courses taught in classrooms that have a fixed seating and/or laboratory arrangement. This is an additional type of bias being brought into the form even as the form was attempting to address other forms of evaluation bias. Other concerns included questions about validation of items as measuring effective teaching (e.g., difficulty of class) and how they would relate to the current questions 15 and 16 which are used often not only for annual evaluation of faculty but also as a metric to assess candidates for promotion. Finally, concerns were raised about any pilot testing adding bias by focusing on types of classes and/or tenure status of instructor.

Professor Valdez Pierce, Chair of the committee, noted that validation of items had been a primary objective. They had spent time in the literature and then worked with stakeholders on campus, to include student and faculty focus groups as well as deans, to create items that measured what teachers do rather than what students think about the class. The form is flexible and can be modified,
items moved around, and added or deleted as needed. Questions 15 and 16 were removed as they were the most prone to bias. The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness administers the form and can provide information on how to include individual data for faculty to do their own analysis of their evaluation results and can tell us what can be pulled in to populate the online form without having to ask it. They can also tell us about what other characteristics can be included for analysis, like class size and type. There was a concession that student interpretation of items may be different from what the committee intended (especially the question difficulty of the course) so more pilot testing and validation may be needed. The committee can work with OIRE to address the specifics of the pilot testing to ensure the least amount of bias possible.

Motion to the Faculty Senate - April 3, 2019

The Faculty Senate recommend advancing the revised course evaluation form to the Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness and to the Provost for pilot testing on a large-scale, university-wide basis with both face-to-face and online courses during AY 2019-20.

The motion was seconded. An amendment was made to restrict administration of this form to tenured faculty only. The amendment was not approved. A second amendment was made and seconded to include “hybrid” courses, so the final phrase reads: ...with face-to-face, hybrid, and online courses during AY 2019-20. The amendment was approved. A third amendment to add “My instructor seems knowledgeable about the subject matter” to the form was made and seconded. The committee chair replied that they are asking for the form itself to move forward as one that is generally acceptable rather than discuss specific questions. A Senator made a point of order that the amendment was not germane to the motion. The Faculty Senate Chair ruled that the amendment was not germane and was not to be further discussed.

The motion as amended was approved and appears below:

The Faculty Senate recommend advancing the revised course evaluation form to the Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness and to the Provost for pilot testing on a large-scale, university-wide basis with face-to-face, hybrid and online courses during AY 2019-20.

Multilingual Academic Support Committee – Shelley Reid co-chair
Dr. Reid provided an abbreviated version of the committee’s report. Now in its third year, please see the full report for additional information.

Annual Faculty Senate Evaluation of President/Provost

Annual Reports
Academic Appeals

Attachment B

Link to annual report
VI.  Unfinished Business

Additional Gift Acceptance Policy Motion #2 was postponed from the previous meeting. The motion had been amended as follows prior to being postponed.

With regard to Article II Section C.6, the FS recommends that the full GAC will determine if a gift meets criteria for additional scrutiny. If the faculty representatives on the GAC are not in accord with the determination of the committee regarding the need for review, they shall raise their objections with the executive committee of the Faculty Senate for further review. If the Executive Committee concurs with the concerns of the faculty representatives on the GAC, the matter shall be brought before the full Faculty Senate for review and recommendation of gift acceptance, with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to determine the best way to present the issue to the Faculty Senate.

A motion was made and seconded to strike Motion #2. The motion to strike was approved.

VII.  New Business – none.

VIII. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty

In Memoriam – Tom Kiley
Our colleague, Tom Kiley, passed away on November 12, 2018. He taught mathematics at Mason for 43 years, retiring as Associate Professor Emeritus.
Tom was an active participant in faculty governance, and in 1974 was one of the founders of the George Mason University Faculty Senate. It is impossible to convey the profound influence Tom had on establishing the firm foundation, policies, and traditions on which this Faculty Senate relies. In addition to his many contributions to shared governance, we remember him here as a Chair of the Senate, and as the first and long-serving Chair of the Academic Policies Committee.

Remarks from outgoing Faculty Senate Chair Keith Renshaw:

The past three years representing you have been an amazing experience. This was never something I thought I would do or want to do - particularly when I was elected in the midst of protests! I have worked hard to represent the faculty voice in a number of specific issues, but also tried to amplify our voice and input across the board.

In particular, I tried to emphasize the importance of faulty input into early stages of strategy and problem solving, not just have things announced to us or run by us for tweaks in wording. The most prominent examples have been the Term Faculty Task Force and Gift Acceptance but also in New Ventures Advisory Council, and Research Advisory Council/Research Council.

I’ve seen that there is a huge variety of perspectives and orientations across campus, across admin and faculty but also within faculty. I do want to say one thing, though - everyone has the best intentions of the university and its students in mind. You may disagree with ideas and methods, but I think we do everyone a disservice when we make hostile assumptions about intent. I hope FS continues to grow as a strong voice of the faculty providing critical but constructive input on all issues. I thank you all for your trust, your wisdom, and your work over the past few years. It's been my honor, and I look forward to continuing to work with you (if I’m re-elected to Senate!) in the future.

IX. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Shannon N. Davis
Secretary
# George Mason University

## Course Evaluation Form

**Course Title (e.g., HIST 101 001)**

Instructor’s Name

---

### Student Information

1) What is your class level?
   - [ ] Fresh.
   - [ ] Soph.
   - [ ] Junior
   - [ ] Senior
   - [ ] Mast.
   - [ ] Doct.
   - [ ] Other

2) For your plan of study, this course is:
   - [ ] a required course
   - [ ] elective course
   - [ ] Mason Core/general education course
   - [ ] Other

3) What is the class format/delivery?
   - [ ] Face-to-face
   - [ ] Hybrid
   - [ ] Online

4) How many times were you absent from class sessions?
   - [ ] 0-1
   - [ ] 2-3
   - [ ] 4-5
   - [ ] 6-7
   - [ ] 8 or more
   - [ ] N/A

5) On average, how many hours per week outside of class did you spend preparing for this class?
   - [ ] 1-3
   - [ ] 4-6
   - [ ] 7-9
   - [ ] 10 or more hours

6) What grade do you expect in this course?
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [ ] F
   - [ ] Pass
   - [ ] Fail
   - [ ] Other

### Please thoughtfully consider the following statements and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>N/A or Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7) I completed all assigned tasks before each class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) I consistently contributed to class activities/discussions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) I gained an understanding of the main concepts in this course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) I learned through the variety of learning opportunities (e.g., assignments, projects, discussions, group work, peer review, exams) provided.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) I found the instructor’s feedback helpful for learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) I learned due to the instructor’s teaching methods/style.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) The instructor created an environment that facilitated my engagement with course content.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) The instructor encouraged expression of diverse perspectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) The instructor offered opportunities for students to provide feedback on the course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) The instructor offered opportunities to meet outside of class time, such as virtual or in-person office hours.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) The instructor used technologies and/or resources/tools that increased my engagement with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructor Preparation and Course Organization

18) The course organization supported my learning. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
19) The instructor clearly communicated course requirements to students. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
20) The instructor clearly presented the course content. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩

Please respond to the following questions

1) Were there any significant obstacles to learning that were **beyond the control of the instructor** (e.g., scheduling or technology problems, university closings, limitations caused by other students or by group dynamics)? If so, please explain.

2) What 2 – 3 aspects of this course were **most valuable** to your learning experience?

   •
   •
   •

3) What 2 – 3 aspects of this course were **least valuable** to your learning experience?

   •
   •
   •

4) What modifications do you suggest for the next time the course is taught?

   

*Thank you for your feedback!*
## Technology Use

1) Navigation throughout the online components of the course was appropriate for the complexity of the course.  
2) The course directed students to technology resources to help them succeed in an online learning environment.  
3) To what extent did the technology used in this course (e.g., Blackboard, synchronous learning, discussion board, Wikis) facilitate your learning?
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Evaluation of the President and Provost by Faculty Senate Standing Committees, University Standing Committees, and Ad Hoc Committees AY 2018-19

Responses compiled April 2019
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: A group of administrators under the Provost’s office introduced a new Drop Deadline for University classes without any faculty involvement and without timely notification (just as Fall Semester began). Since the Drop Deadline is an academic policy, any change to it has traditionally been made with Faculty Senate approval. See Faculty Senate Minutes, Sept. 5, 2018.

Faculty Matters: Our committee has been consulted/briefed on multiple initiatives, including the term faculty task force, faculty activity collaboration tool acquisition, and the Mason COACHE initiative.

Nominations: Not relevant.

Responses from University Standing Committees:

Adult Learning and Executive Education: Following an unsuccessful search for a new executive director for the Executive and Professional Education Program (EPE) during 2018, a decision was made to move the EPE’s executive education function to a different program in the School of Business. A new search for an EPE executive director is underway. The committee was informed about this by the current interim director of EPE.

Athletic Council: N/A

Faculty Handbook: No initiatives or goals fell under the charge of the committee.

Mason Core: This year, both the President and Provost included a goal about developing a course in diversity, inclusion, and well-being. As the President’s goals stated, “In collaboration with the faculty, develop a foundational course for all undergraduate students which reflects the university’s values and commitment to diversity, inclusion and wellbeing.” While the language in the goals reflected collaboration with faculty, much of the conversation on campus centered around this becoming a required course for all students, which effectively would make this a Mason Core requirement. While many faculty, including the Chair of the Mason Core Committee, were involved
in the discussions about and development of ideas for this course after the goals were announced, it would have been much more helpful to have had conversations with the Mason Core committee before these goals were announced. The Mason Core Committee could have shared ways that many Core courses and courses outside of the Core are already accomplishing these outcomes, could have talked through the curriculum proposal process, and could have helped to facilitate conversations about this initiative in ways that would have been more consistent with the principle that the curriculum is in the purview of the faculty, and which could have helped to mitigate concerns about this feeling like a top-down initiative to many on campus.

**Research Advisory:** Yes, the following realignment was announced. Deb Crawford (VP for Research) was appointed to lead a new Office of Research, Innovation and Economic Impact. The office has 3 units: 1) Research Development and Services team, led by Mike Laskofski; 2) Research and Innovation Initiatives team led by Aurali Dade; and, 3) A Community and Economic Initiatives team (no named led as of yet). In addition, several multidisciplinary centers were announced.

The alignment was considered to be administrative which did not affect the research agenda of the University. But, the Research Committee was not consulted about this realignment or asked for guidance. It is unclear how much this realignment impacts the research agenda at Mason. The VPR related that this realignment was more of an administrative nature in order to meet the growing demand of responsibilities. If the realignment indeed impacts the research agenda, faculty input would have been important to incorporate.

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 Provost’s office responded adequately after the Faculty Senate disapproved the change, recommended a new temporary Drop Deadline, and asked to meet with the administrators who work in academic affairs to discuss a new deadline or reestablishment of the previous deadline.

**Faculty Matters:** Yes. In Fall 2018, we requested information from HR about parental leave policies. We received adequate response in a timely manner. In Spring 2019, we requested information from HR regarding instructional T/TT faculty who are required to generate a portion of AY salary. The response in this case was much delayed and we did not receive the requested data. HR has stated that the Provost and the COS are having a discussion and will provide our committee the numbers requested along with a response.

**Nominations:** Yes, we asked for Provost appointees from the Provost and other members of administration, and we received prompt responses to all requests.

**Responses from University Standing Committees:**
Adult Learning and Executive Education: Not applicable.

Athletic Council: Frank Neville regularly attend the meetings and is always very responsive to my emails.

Faculty Handbook: The committee had extensive meetings with a representative from the Provost’s office. The Assoc. Provost of Academic Administration undertook discussions and actions that furthered units’ compliance with the Faculty Handbook.

Mason Core: Dr. Bethany Usher, the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, is a member of and facilitates the work of the Mason Core Committee, and she was a liaison between the committee and the Provost and President, when needed. Because she was a part of every meeting, she was able to actively participate in our work and conversations throughout the year, and her office provided significant administrative support to the committee.

Research Advisory Committee: The Research Committee did not seek information or input from anyone this past year.

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: The best interaction is to keep the committee informed of changes, problems, issues in a timely manner. The F.S. Academic Policies Committee now sends a representative to meet with these administrators (Policy Management Group, PMG). However, since a substantial part of their discussions relate to academic policies and faculty, there needs to be a more formal way for them to communicate with AP and the Faculty Senate.

Nominations: No changes needed.

Responses from University Standing Committees:

Adult Learning and Executive Education:

As stated in our committee report, the committee would like to meet with the new director of EPE and other appropriate staff of the Provost’s Office in the coming academic year to confer about how this committee might advise and assist in their efforts to expand executive and professional education and adult learning programs as part of the university’s strategic plan for 2024.

Athletic Council: N/A

Faculty Handbook: The Provost and his staff effectively interact with the Committee.

Mason Core: Dr. Usher has been working with the committee to continue to push to make this a faculty-driven and faculty-owned process, and that’s a shift that we would like to see continue.
**Research Advisory:** While the Research Committee is present at the Research Council meetings led by Dr. Crawford, these meetings are more administrative and informational. It would be beneficial if the representatives from the Research Council met with Dr. Crawford, Mr. Laskofski, and Dr. Dade three times a year to discuss matters related to the faculty, research, infrastructure, and other issues that cannot be addressed in the large meeting.

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 information.

**Faculty Matters:** Overall, our interactions with the administration has been positive.

**Nominations:** Thank you for your prompt responses to requests for nominees and other information.

**Responses from University Standing Committees:**

**Adult Learning and Executive Education:** Nothing to add.

**Athletic Council:** We have very good interactions and I feel that if I needed information or support, I would quickly obtain an answer.

**Faculty Handbook:** The Provost’s office has made their calendar coordinator available to schedule Faculty Handbook meetings. It would be nearly impossible for the faculty chair to schedule meetings without this help.

**Mason Core:** N/A