Present: Alan Abramson, Mark Addleson, Lisa Billingham, Shannon Davis, Tim Leslie, Keith Renshaw, Suzanne Slayden, Girum Urgessa, Provost David Wu, Sr. VP J.J.Davis, Kim Eby, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Development.

I. Approval of Minutes of January 22, 2018 and February 14, 2018: The minutes were approved.

II. Announcements

Provost Wu: There will be a workshop on April 20th from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. to prepare for the second round of curricular impact grants. Deadline for submission of full proposals is June 1st. Sixteen were funded in the last round of proposals. This will be an annual occurrence, the results will be announced early enough to work on over the summer.

Mason is hosting a Symposium on the Opioid Crisis on April 19th. A faculty working group has been working on it for a few months. It is the biggest health crisis in the nation. Mason has expertise in the Psychology Department, Schar School of Policy and Government, and College of Health and Human Services. Governor Northam will open the symposium in the morning. Faculty sessions will take place in the afternoon, providing an opportunity to physically gather – tables will have different topics; faculty can join any table you wish. Former VA Secretary and Health and Human Services, Dr. Bill Hazel, has joined Mason – a big champion in addressing opioid crises in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The CHSS Dean search is ongoing and on schedule. The first candidate will be here today and tomorrow. More will arrive next week and the following week. Public meetings are scheduled. We expect to have dean identified by the end of the academic year.

The University-wide Giving Day for faculty and staff to contribute to their favorite cause will take place Thursday, April 5th. It was a big success last year, giving from faculty and staff more than doubled in this one day.

Sr. VP J.J. Davis reported on budget news from the Commonwealth. The legislature has departed and will reconvene April 11th. There is speculation about whether they will start with Governor McAuliffe’s budget, House, Senate versions, or a brand new Governor’s budget. With a 6-week review, the earliest we will see resolution is in June,
but we need to set tuition in May. There will be an orientation meeting for the BOV on April 11th to talk about state uncertainty, financial plan. Soon we will close out the FY 17 financials. Student health insurance is a large cost center, so we potentially have a proposal coming to the BOV – still in flux, may save some money. The refinancing of Merten Hall should save some money.

We are holding a variety of Town Halls

-1- Strategic Plan: macroeconomic look and ask people to participate

-2- Tuition Town Hall for students, as we do every year.

-3- Core Campus Project Conversation – how construction on Robinson and facilities will impact people.

The lack of clarity around state budget means we’ll have to do our best guess; it may have to be tweaked. May include a moderate tuition increase around 5%; will try to do something for compensation. There are a lot of moving parts – do the best we can do. Student Health Care funding today: students pay for with their own money, a voluntary program, and some E & G money; to try to get some savings for students out-of-pocket. Health insurance is mandatory for graduate students.

The 5K Team Run takes place April 12th at Merten Hall; you can sign up online at HR.

III. Progress reports, business, and agenda items from Senate Standing Committees

- Academic Policies – Suzanne Slayden

  We have not heard a word about the 2020-21 Calendar.

- Budget and Resources – Tim Leslie

  A draft powerpoint Budget Model Brief was distributed to the Executive Committee for suggestions and questions. Chair Tim Leslie noted this presentation is aimed at faculty; not what the deans are doing.

  Commentary about slide content:

  - JJ noted macro picture in the past was not transparent. The current administration inherited a system of “doling dollars” from central administration to (colleges/schools). The new system offers a lot of responsibility and opportunities for colleges they never had before; the right accountability. Provost Wu added we are in a growth mode. Analyses show degree costs $20K/year; tuition brings in between $5-10K/year.

  - Over a five year process, this is the third year we are doing this. In the third year, 9 out of 10 schools had revenue greater than expenses. Need to define
where revenues are coming from. Tim noted philanthropic activities not included here.

- Incentive model and revenue: How to decrease expenses by a variety of methods. At the end of the year, if tuition revenue above expenses, net value positive, you can run a fund balance. If tuition revenue below expenses, then you have to pay out of fund balance.

- What is the scope for decreasing expenses? What are the impacts? Skeptical of short term focus, akin to corporate model

- Provost Wu:
  - More nuanced than it appears. Our long-term quality and reputation matters a lot. Another view regarding accreditation where SACS looks at full time/part time (faculty) for the unit, not just cutting costs, increased number of students.
  - What is the surplus money actually going to do? Dean could use for start-up funding for faculty; salary adjustments to make up for lower ones, resources from unit surplus. They also have to remain attentive to requirements of individual accreditation for units.
  - After Budget Model implemented, there was a notable increase in the number of tenure-track faculty hired. Trend of increasing budget – 170 new faculty were hired last year. College has to have more funding to hire – if they do, they can.

- What happens if a school has a deficit?
  - JJ: We’ll have bridge funding and they have to have a plan. Example: the Law School using naming gift to recruit additional students; hiring of additional faculty used foundation money – not seen here. For five years, added another Executive Committee member.

- Are course fees included in model?
  - JJ: We are working on a course fee simplification. Deans cannot unilaterally or arbitrarily raise fees.

- Budget Model 2.0:
  - 1- Cross college Multidisciplinary Programs. Delighted to see this with experience of five years’ teaching.
  - 2- Existing programs with combined units will go out in July (e.g. Chemistry and Computing). The final model is not being announced yet.

- Indirects scored on a parallel process, similar manner: $100M research funding how to incentivize system in a similar manner? Established target base on historical trends. Current indirect rate is in keeping with other R1s: 65%, 35%. In new budget model, anything
above target base will result in 20%/80% split. If below units will meet with Central to discuss why and put plan in place.

Suggestions for presentation:

- This is all really important information. We need to emphasize within context of overall university mission to deliver quality education and research. Tension always there, to put more responsibility to the units to deliver on our mission. Needs broader context in mission of university.
- Need to make time to explain course code and major code to make sure concept is understood.
- Need to be specific about what kind of things you are tracking. Every college has chosen at least fifteen metrics. Almost all are non-financial, as part of the Strategic Plan.
- There is a lot of material, to really cut down. Length too much for number of questions, perhaps focus on present part now, and the future part later.
- Concern that a lot of faculty may not be able to attend the extra meeting (March 28th), when this is scheduled for. No one objected to videoing it. J.J. suggested a lunch and learn session as follow up.

- **Faculty Matters – Alan Abramson and Girum Urgessa**
  
  Annual Evaluation of Chairs/Directors: see Attachment A for motion/background.

  Discussion: We support it, but need to recommend specific language for the Faculty Handbook – suggest tweaking some of ODU language presented on pp. 7-8 Attachment A. Others concerned about potential impact of so many questionnaires; but there is a deeper issue if there aren’t enough effective channels to do that.

In collecting information from current department chairs, the committee learned some have served for twenty years and were never given an evaluation. There are about 59 department chairs – many may be doing a fantastic job; several may want this.

Department chair evaluation is important to do. Department chairs get raises (from Deans) without faculty input, important to get faculty point of view. It may not be enough to just say FS endorses it, and we have to use a template to make it work. Might need to put some teeth into this, which requires Provost buy-in – have Provost require that Deans ensure it gets done.

Suggest a multipronged approach with Provost support (enforcement) and including language in the Faculty Handbook. FM should talk with Provost Wu about this. This
might be an issue to work on throughout the next academic year, to develop Faculty Handbook language and procedures with the Provost Office.

FS meeting: discuss factors that faculty should evaluate with regard to Deans’ performance.

FM will attend a meeting on Thursday to talk with deans about inputs to Faculty Evaluation of Administrators survey, with idea to begin in Fall 2018.

Do we want to have a meeting/forum to determine what feedback the faculty think should be included? Or just use a common sense approach? We can look at how Provost Wu evaluates the deans, but also need to ensure this is our evaluation – faculty should have some say as to what goes into it. This can be done without using time at a FS meeting.

- **Nominations – Mark Addleson**

  The election of a nominee to serve on the Research Advisory Committee was held over form our last meeting (March 7, 2018). A Senator wrote to us offering a replacement for her during the spring term for medical reasons. Mark has written to the acting Dean about their procedures. He appreciated her due diligence in finding a faculty member willing to replace her.

- **Organization and Operations – Lisa Billingham**

  Faculty Support Liaison will not be ready for March 28th FS Agenda. We have a meeting at 2:30 p.m.

  A concern was expressed that faculty need real help in terms of issues like job termination – there is a maze of procedures, with no understanding of how to navigate them. We need a mandated new policy. We need to move forward immediately on Faculty Liaison model, it is needed right now. Maybe we could do it by offering a small pilot of the new model? However, no liaisons identified to date; doing so midstream at end of semester would make it difficult to find people, and training would take time.

  Several persons volunteered to serve on the Grievance Committee, but only one could be elected – maybe one of them could act in this role?

  Main way to address the time issue is with a course release – but that’s not possible at this point in the year. Also, development of policies and training will take longer than anyone wants, at least it is there. Lisa to continue exploring with HR, SVP, and University Counsel.
IV. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

- **Academic Initiatives: Mason Korea Brief** - Tim Leslie
  Should there be one Faculty Handbook applicable to Mason Korea or should the campus have its own? They made their own with a lot of substantive differences. Frank Neville recommended Provost Wu brief this – a broader presentation regarding the specifics vs. HR – end goal to have Faculty Senate vote whether to approve a single Faculty Handbook.

  Discussion:
  - Why not ask them to write what they need? There is likely a lot in Faculty Handbook re tenure/tenure track which they may not use.
  - How much background do we need to make a decision?
    - Mason Korea is a public-private partnership à la INTO. Need to define what “public-private partnership” is.
  - Provost Wu offered his perspective: Other than macro-level principles, has not seen actual proposal. Motivation of full time faculty (most of whom are not tenure-track) very unclear. They do not know what in the Faculty Handbook applies to them. The leadership on the ground rightfully doubts we can wholesale apply the Faculty Handbook there, given local laws and constraints, so they developed a faculty handbook applicable to them. We think they should use the GMU Faculty Handbook and develop an addendum regarding legal constraints.
  - It’s a principle, a bigger issue of governance. Is Mason Korea simply ‘branded’ Mason, or is there a germane role that Mason plays in shaping cultural, intellectual and educational climate there?
  - Provost Wu: Clearly the latter, students receive a Mason degree.
  - A member of the Handbook Committee is looking at this; may be helpful to check with Michelle Marks (Vice President for Academic Innovation and New Ventures).
  - The Mason Korea Board says it needs some sort of signal what faculty want.

- **Minority/Diversity Issues w. AI**: Diversity Statements – for March 28th agenda, see [Attachment B]
  - Some discussion ensued:
    - Is this really needed? What is the purpose of such statements?
    - Just because it is becoming common practice does not mean it is best practice
  - Ultimately, two committees want to bring it to FS – no clear problems or recommendations in wording of motions, so fine to proceed

- **Undergraduate Council By Laws** submitted for March 28th agenda for approval; please send any revisions to Tim Leslie.
V. New Business, Updates, and Discussion

- Infrastructure Investment to Promote Faculty Collaboration and Partnerships
  Kim Eby, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Development
  - Kim distributed an information sheet on a Provost Office project, asks for your feedback and support (Attachment C). We are exploring investing in tools to do/help work of faculty to keep track of things, leverage better.
  - Currently systems are different across units, and this shows up when we focus on multidisciplinary work. How to help faculty who are interested, connecting faculty members?
  - There are also active conversations in Research Council. Systems like this help us to have a better institutional perspective, to leverage expertise in different ways.
  - Examples include graduate student recruitment, Office of Communication wants to shout out about the work faculty are doing. Present feels more ad hoc, unaware; lack systemic way to do these things.
  - There are different types of products out there. Digital measures, “stutter step” did not go anywhere.
  - Conversations with Interfolio included “Faculty 180” reporting tool with Research Council and the deans. We had a bigger meeting in January and received good feedback from Institutional Assessment. Provost Wu noted department chairs had very positive response.
  - As part of her listening tour, Kim wants to (1) form a small group to work with her on process; and (2) Advisory Group to hear pitches from different companies. The Research Council, department chairs and faculty from some units are involved. Opportunity to explore options for migrating data – private to them and faculty members control who gets access to common database. There are fees in terms of integrating into other databases units have spoken to, beyond automatic updates, etc.
  - Sees this as helpful as we are new at it. Module for faculty reporting, module to prepare for P&T, to access within the institution. Kim asks for your backing. Also should there be a report to FS, and if so, who would make that report (Faculty Matters)?

Questions and Discussion:
  - Tools available in the past to look at what people were writing, is this desirable? Or whether tools support you? How much do you want to connect with people in the institution?
  - Kim replied the Research Council sees this as most important, with search tools. Another EXC member expressed strong support.
Overall, broad support for the work group and the advisory council.

- President/Provost Evaluation by committees – after some discussion, it was decided to include the President/Provost Evaluation by committees to the final FS Meeting Agenda but separate from annual reports submitted by the committees.

- FH Language regarding participation in 2nd level review
  - Will likely need to have discussion of the issue of Asst/Assoc Deans

VI. Agenda Items for March 28, 2018 FS Meeting

- Draft FS Minutes March 7, 2018
- Announcements
  - Provost Wu
- FSSC Reports
  - AP: AY 20-21 Calendar
  - BR: Budget Model Brief
  - Nominations: O&O, RAC, ITGG
- Other Committee Reports
  - AI: Mason Korea Presentation and Handbook Discussion
  - AI/Minority & Diversity Issues: Diversity Statement in Job Hires
  - FH: Discussion of 2nd level review committees
- New Business

VII. Agenda Items for April 4, 2018 FS Meeting

- Announcements
  - Provost Wu
- FSSC Reports
  - FM: Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation
- Other Committee Reports
  - Faculty Handbook revisions 2nd view and vote
  - Multilingual Academic Support Committee (or 4/25)
- New Business

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Meg Caniano
Faculty Senate clerk
Attachment A

Annual Faculty Evaluation of Department Chairs

Draft motion:
“The FM committee moves that the Faculty Senate endorse the practice of annual faculty evaluations of department chairs, division directors, and other local unit administrators and request that the Faculty Handbook Committee add language mandating these reviews to the Faculty Handbook. Each School would be responsible for its own procedures for conducting these reviews.”

Background:
The Faculty Matters (FM) committee of the GMU Faculty Senate (FS) was tasked to investigate annual faculty evaluation of department chairs. The overarching questions that was referred to FM committee for resolution is as follows:
“Faculty have a mechanism to evaluate senior administrators (president, provost, and deans) on an annual basis. In a similar fashion, should faculty have a mechanism to evaluate department chairs annually in addition to their involvement at the appointment and/or renewal stages of their chairs?”

Preliminary discussions at FS:
Ahead of the October 4, 2017 FS meeting, the FM committee submitted the following questions to the FS (refer to Faculty Senate Agenda, Oct. 4, 2017, Page 7).
“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?”

FM Committee Chair Alan Abramson took the floor of the FS during the October 4, 2017 meeting and solicited input from senators. These discussions are documented in the FS Meeting Minutes (Oct. 4, 2017, Pages 11-12). It was very clear that faculty do not have a good sense of how their department chairs are evaluated annually by their deans or what criteria are used for evaluation. On October 5, FS Chair-Keith Renshaw, sent an e-mail to the all members of the FS encouraging them to reach out to the FM committee with additional inputs.

Written comments received from the FS and beyond:
Few written comments were received, including from two senators and a department chair. The comments are provided below.

Comment from senator #1:
“With respect to evaluation of chair: I am ambivalent about that for the following reasons:
  a. Some departments are very small and therefore it is difficult to keep anonymity.”
b. Untenured faculty may not want to criticize, which reduces even further the pool of potential people who may respond.

c. Being department chair is typically perceived as a sacrifice and very few faculty members want to be chair. So, I am afraid if we add an evaluation we may end up scaring potential candidates.

d. I think that if there are serious problems with a chair, senior faculty should approach him/her and if the issues are not resolved the Dean should be contacted.”

Comment from senator #2:
“See below for information about the system that’s been used to evaluate department chairs in the School of Business for the past few years.”

The forwarded e-mail reads as follows:
“You and the other Senators are probably up to date about evaluation of chairs in the School of Business, but if not, I can provide input for the Faculty Senate discussion: In the time that I’ve been the chair, an evaluation of our chair performance is provided by the Dean. This score accounts for the “administrative” portion of our faculty evaluation score and is used in conjunction with the research, teaching, and service scores that are determined by the department’s tenured faculty and reviewed by the FDEC to determine our overall evaluation score. I don’t have a blank copy of the performance appraisal form that I receive from the Dean, but it includes the following information in a narrative format:
1. Overall summary of the past cycle’s performance
2. Brief description of work strengths and weaknesses
3. Performance goals/plan, including training and professional development for next cycle.

It also includes the same performance level scale (1-7) as our teaching, service, research scores use. Then there are the following: Essential Factors and Management sections. The Essential Factors section includes the following factors and department chairs and the evaluation levels are: Superior, Satisfactory, Needs Work (with a comments section for each):
1) Leadership
2) Change Orientation
3) Planning
4) Communication

The Management section includes the following factors (same evaluation levels and comment section for each as for the Essential Factors):
1) Task/Project Management
2) Diversity Management
3) Conflict Management
4) Performance Management of direct reports
5) Teamwork & Cooperation
6) Privacy & Computer Security (Confidentiality)
7) Manage Work/Life Issues
8) Customer Service

The chairs can provide the Dean (as supervisor) a self-evaluation for input into the process and I’ll forward this blank form to you separately. Also, to my knowledge, for the first time since I became
the chair, the Dean (Interim Dean in this case), asked for input on my evaluation from the Tenured and Tenure Track faculty in this last cycle (2016-2017 AY). I don’t have suggestions for improvement of this process except that I worry that new chairs are not always clear on how they will be evaluated. Our chair contract includes our responsibilities, but does not mention all of the “Essential Factors” and “Management” factors in it – such as change orientation, diversity management, etc. Although not a problem for me, I know it was a surprise to me the first year I was evaluated on these criteria. I’ve also forwarded to new chairs the self-evaluation form (usually when I remember to do so in early summer) so that they are aware of it being sent out by the Dean’s office later in the summer and have more time to prepare.”

Comment from a department chair:
“I understand that the Faculty Matters Committee was asking about faculty evaluation of department chairs. Speaking for ****, there is no regular evaluation of the Chair by the faculty except when the Chair is seeking a renewal. I think this is true for all of the College of *****, but I am not sure. Back in either 2011 or 2012, I initiated my own evaluation. I appointed a committee who then developed a questionnaire that was sent out to the faculty. They then wrote a report to me copied to the Dean. ***********************.* I am half way through a four year term as Chair and will not seek renewal. We did not write a regular evaluation of the chair into our bylaws. But the Dean is now requiring an annual report. But what is frustrating is that there is never any feedback from the Dean concerning my performance. I have chaired off and on for ***** years and never received any kind of written evaluation from any Dean that I reported to.”

Existing practice at Mason:
In early November, FM sent an e-mail to all 10 deans asking for current practices of department chair annual evaluations at Mason (in addition to collecting feedback on other items of interest to the committee). At the time of writing of this report, only 6 of the 10 deans or their representatives have submitted their responses. The following table summarizes the responses received by the FM committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Official response from units by Deans/Associate Deans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEHD</td>
<td>“CEHD has no academic department. Instead, it has divisions representing clusters of academic programs, with a director who helps oversee those programs (in addition to an academic program coordinator). Division directors have an academic and academic policy focus. They do not administer sizable budgets nor do they evaluate the program faculty in their division. The division structure was put into place as a permanent structure just a few years ago, with division directors each appointed to a 5-year renewable term. That initial 5-year period will be expiring soon, and so a major task for 2018 is to formulate an appropriate review procedure. Consistent with the College’s shared governance structure, faculty input will play a significant role in the renewal process.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Chairs are evaluated by faculty as part of regular departmental evaluation of all faculty in a department. However, these reviews are not exclusively concerned with the work of the chair. That exclusive review by faculty happens only at chair renewal time. The former dean was beginning a chair-specific review by the dean, and produces one for this review cycle. However, it remains to be seen whether that practice will continue.”

“Department chairs, and school and research center directors are evaluated annually via a formal evaluation by the Dean of COS, their direct supervisor. We do not have a formal process in place for faculty to provide input. Faculty are afforded the opportunity to provide feedback of chairs/directors during the appointment or renewal process (per the faculty handbook).”

“Chair/director renewals include a review process involving program faculty and led by the Dean”

“Not applicable”

“Department Chairs are not a part of S-CAR structure. Very flat, little hierarchy!”

College of Health and Human Services, Schar School of Policy and Government, School of Business, and Volgenau School of Engineering did not submit official responses on this specific issue. The FM committee has attempted to reach out to faculty in these four units and the following table summarizes those findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unofficial response from faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHHS</td>
<td>The college does not seem to have a policy of involving faculty in annual evaluation of department chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schar</td>
<td>The school does not have a departmental structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>The school does not seem to have a policy of involving faculty in annual evaluation of department chairs. However, refer to comment from senator #2 (page 2 of this report). Recently, an interim dean solicited input from tenured and tenure track faculty for conducting annual evaluation of chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSE</td>
<td>The school does not seem to have a policy of involving faculty in annual evaluation of department chairs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FM committee concluded that Mason faculty do not have a mechanism to participate in annual evaluations of their department chairs except in one or two schools.

**Recommendation from the FM committee to the FS:**

The FM committee has consulted other resources before finalizing its recommendation, including AAUP’s policy on evaluation of administrators/chairs and similar practices at other universities. The appendix to this report includes sample resources reviewed by the committee. On March 27, 2018, the FM committee unanimously agreed that Mason faculty should be given the opportunity to participate in annual evaluation of department chairs, division directors, or other local unit administrators.
Appendix

AAUP:
AAUP does not seem to have a policy position on this issue. However, in discussing faculty evaluation of administrators, the following relevant points are described.
https://www.aaup.org/report/faculty-evaluation-administrators

- On the broad principle of evaluation of “administrators”
  “The most effective systems of administrator evaluation are those that occur periodically as part of a collaborative endeavor involving the faculty, the administration, other campus constituencies with a stake in the outcome, and the individual under review. The system should be not only periodic (as affecting the individual) but also regular, that is, part of the institutional structure, rather than being triggered on an ad hoc basis that requires the reinvention of the wheel for each separate review. In some extreme cases in which the right of the faculty to undertake such a review is not enshrined in either institutional policy or precedent, it may be necessary for a representative body of the faculty to take on the evaluation of an administrator’s performance without waiting to be asked. Clearly, the most desirable, as well as the most effective, system is one that rests on sound institutional policy, healthy relationships among the parties, and scrupulously fair practice. Indeed, such a system at its best will involve not only evaluation, but also constructive mentoring, as is the case with the best systems of faculty evaluation.”

- On evaluation of department chairs:
  “The evaluation of department chairs or heads is a partially separate (or separable) matter. The tendency of AAUP policy has been to view such persons as faculty rather than as administrators. Local practices, however, as well as some unit determinations in collective-bargaining elections that class departmental executive officers as supervisors, may well point in another direction. In the most democratic model, in which a department chair is periodically elected by a majority vote of departmental colleagues, the election is a summary evaluation or, at the very least, an acknowledgment that no one else in the ranks is better fitted or willing to serve. In cases where a departmental executive officer is appointed by a dean, albeit with faculty input, the kinds of evaluation addressed in this statement are more germane, particularly so when there is no automatic presumption that continuance is guaranteed or that a replacement will necessarily come from the ranks of the present faculty.”

Sample example on practices outside of GMU:
There are examples of large institutions who provide a mechanism for their faculty to be involved in annual evaluation of department chairs. For example, ODU is a good example from VA.
http://ww2.odu.edu/ao/facultyhandbook/facultyhandbook.pdf

  “Annual evaluations of performance are an administrative responsibility of the dean and are to be conducted. The evaluation shall be based on annual identification of each chair’s goals and objectives, established in collaboration with the dean. The evaluation shall be conducted and completed each spring prior to the salary adjustment process. The evaluation shall be based on
actual accomplishments in relation to previously established goals and objectives. Deans will obtain input from all departmental faculty each year using a written survey. The process shall provide for anonymity. The evaluation shall be discussed with each chair and reported to the provost and vice president for academic affairs. A summary of the feedback will be shared by the dean with department faculty. No formal report of the annual performance evaluation shall be required for publication to faculty.”

Attachment B

Motion Regarding Diversity and Inclusivity Statements in Faculty Hires

Motion

We, the Faculty Senate, endorse the inclusion of A STATEMENT DETAILING YOUR EXPERIENCE AND COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSIVITY IN AN ACADEMIC CONTEXT in faculty hiring portfolios, starting with AY 2019-2020. In addition, we advocate that, if such statements are included in applications, the following steps be taken in cooperation with the University Minority and Diversity Issues committee:

1. Resources regarding models, expectations, and evaluation of these statements be made available through the Provost’s Office.

2. Follow-up efforts in diversity, equity, and inclusivity be made by the Provost’s office and the Colleges / Schools.

3. The use of these diversity and inclusivity statements is given a critical re-examination in the Spring of 2022 with regards to their benefits and costs (across all dimensions) by a group equally composed of faculty and administrators

Rationale

Based on their successful implementation and subsequent outcomes at other institutions, we believe adding these statements into job portfolios will achieve the following:

1. Communicate the importance the values of diversity, equity, and inclusivity at George Mason University to job candidates,

2. Require the candidate to have considered and formalized their thoughts regarding diversity, equity, and inclusivity

3. Provide an outlet within which to evaluate candidates on their contributions to the broadening culture and practice here at George Mason that might not otherwise be observed in a candidate’s portfolio

4. Bring us into the best practices currently implemented at peer institutions across the United States, including (but not limited to):
[CDE is compiling the list]

We have heard concerns about such a move and acknowledge possible drawbacks. In particular, we have heard the following concerns:

1. Evaluating these statements takes too long and may be done poorly, if no guidelines for evaluation are proposed.
2. The statement is just a piece of paper and does not assure any true commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusivity.
3. Adding these statements by itself will not engender broader institutional change and must be accompanied by a series of other measures (e.g., formalizing and posting publicly the potential benefits each department and college sees in inclusivity, mandatory DEI training for search committees, evaluating contributions to DEI in annual evaluations and RPT processes)
4. Requiring job candidates to add another element to their portfolio is burdensome

Despite these concerns, we believe a diversity, equity, and inclusivity statement can be one step of many in our attempt to create a more inclusive climate, and thus is a positive and worthwhile decision in an institution with a diverse, international student body.

Attachment C

Infrastructure Investment to Promote Faculty Collaboration and Partnerships

Spring 2018

As Mason matures as a multifaceted public research university, there is an increased need to promote faculty expertise and academic programs to prospective students, various stakeholders of the university, and the broader community. The University is exploring a few software platforms and tools that will help to collect, integrate and consolidate data around faculty activities and accomplishments. This will help our efforts to leverage faculty strengths across the institution, facilitate faculty collaboration and partnerships, and to tell the story of our faculty strengths to a variety of stakeholders. The Office of the Provost is seeking faculty and administrative input to help guide a decision that will most effectively serve our faculty and Mason.

**Desired Tool:** An integrated system for reporting faculty activities and accomplishments (e.g., Interfolio: Faculty 180, Digital Measures: Activity Insight; or similar tool)

**Advantages:**

- For Faculty
  - Reduces workload by streamlining the process in updating faculty activities and accomplishments, avoiding the need to access multiple locations multiple times
  - Offers capability to easily update websites and export customizable CVs, bio-sketches, and other formats for various awards, grants, annual reporting, etc.
  - Improves processes for faculty by providing a simple online portal for maintaining and verifying information about their academic work
- Provides a vehicle for scholarly networking and collaboration across Mason faculty through creation of verified database to identify colleagues with similar research, teaching, practice and service interests

- For Programs
  - Provides a searchable, verified database that can assist in accessing and leveraging data for strategic purposes:
    - Marketing academic programs and faculty expertise to a broad community
    - Making faculty highlights visible to prospective students and donors
    - Promoting faculty accomplishments and demonstrating impact across the university, to the Commonwealth, and beyond
    - Identifying faculty strengths and areas of expertise for connections with external partners
  - Facilitates administrative reporting for compliance and other purposes (e.g., for accreditation)
  - Offers capability to integrate with faculty profiles on Mason website, ensuring current data and information online for internal and external audiences
  - Reduces workload in managing programmatic accreditation (if applicable)

- For Mason
  - Provides a searchable, verified database that can assist in accessing and leveraging data for strategic purposes, particularly vis-à-vis marketing our intellectual capital
  - Facilitates administrative compliance reporting for funders; federal and state agencies; and accreditation (SACS-COC)
  - Offers capability to integrate with faculty profiles on Mason website
  - Affords the opportunity to make informed institutional decisions based on our faculty strengths and activities
  - Facilitates the administrative process for unit and college reviews (annual, merit, promotion & tenure, etc.)