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I. Call to Order: Chair Keith Renshaw called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. Chair Renshaw read from his prepared remarks.
The Special Session of the Faculty Senate will come to order. Thank you all for making the time for this meeting, at a busy time of the semester, and on such short notice.

This meeting was called to address the gift agreements that were released last Friday, April 27, which show evidence of violations of academic integrity and academic independence. As that is the express purpose of the meeting, only business related to that purpose will be discussed.

The Senate sent a list of questions to President Cabrera, Provost Wu, the VP of Advancement Janet Bingham, the General Director of Mercatus Tyler Cowen, the Interim Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences Robert Matz, and the Chair of the Economics Department Dan Houser.

President Cabrera, Provost Wu, and Dean Matz are here today.

Tyler Cowen was unable to be present, but he has sent an initial response to the questions dealing with the Mercatus Center, which were distributed earlier this week. Pending discussion, we may seek to gather follow-up questions and request his attendance at a future meeting.

VP Janet Bingham expressed her desire to be in attendance, but felt unable to do so, given the pending lawsuit against the GMU Foundation.

Chair Houser is out of the country and unable to attend, but Don Boudreaux is in attendance in his stead.

Our meeting will progress as follows. Our guests will be given the floor to address the questions that were submitted to the best of their ability. I ask that we all remember that there was an incredibly short amount of time for them to prepare responses, and that we have a limited amount of time here today. As always, Senators may ask questions or engage in discussion with the speaker throughout this portion. HOWEVER, I ask all of you to be focused and concise in your questions and remarks. For us to be productive today, we must be efficient.

In Faculty Senate meetings, visitors to the Senate are allowed to broach questions and comments when time allows. However, given the short period of time we have, and the urgency of our business, I do not anticipate taking questions from visitors during this portion of today’s meeting. I may make an exception if it appears warranted, but I do not currently plan on that.

After that portion of the meeting is concluded, we have a series of motions that have been forwarded from various groups of Senators. These motions will be presented one at a time, with discussion and voting before moving onto the next. In the case of motions that directly address individuals who are not Faculty Senators, those individuals will be given an opportunity to speak if they are in attendance, after the introduction of the motion and possibly some preliminary discussion by the Senate.
As we proceed, I ask everyone to ensure that we conduct ourselves professionally and respectfully.

President Cabrera, thank you for your attendance today and for your attempts to reply to a very lengthy set of questions in a very short period of time. We look forward to your remarks. The floor is now yours.

Chair Renshaw introduced President Cabrera. President Cabrera thanked Dr. Renshaw for the invitation and the session, and thanked others for being in attendance. The full room is a sign the community cares about academic integrity and our university environment. He organized his remarks to document the sequence of events to the best of his knowledge.

On Friday, April 20, Cabrera was made aware of a number of gift agreements accepted by the university 2003-2011 in Economics. All but one of these agreements included language suggesting the donor could play a role in selection – evaluation process for faculty hires. Cabrera released a statement via email to the university community regarding these documents.

The following Thursday (April 26) the university received a memo from the attorney general’s office, responsive to a FOIA request, that led to the documents released the week before. It became clear to Cabrera that the documents raised questions whether the university was committed to academic independence, so he decided to order a review (letter April 30, 2018) of all active donor agreements supporting faculty positions to determine whether they provide strong protections for academic independence, and allow us to strengthen our ability to protect our academic independence.

In context, the university raises millions of dollars in gifts from many donors. Cabrera documented the increase in fundraising capacity of the university over the last five years and explained his approach to encouraging donors to provide gifts. Cabrera noted that the preference is for the gifts to come with few restrictions in order not to jeopardize academic independence. While unrestricted gifts are preferred, they are rare. Donors provide funds for specific scholarships, programs, buildings, and professorships. When donors want more restrictions, the university works to make sure the restrictions do not jeopardize academic independence. An example is the funding of scholarships (either merit or need-based): a donor cannot say which students get the scholarships. The university welcomes the creation of professorships through gifts but the donor cannot determine who will hold the professorship. Hiring is governed by faculty committees. The president’s office has turned down gifts and gets involved when necessary in the negotiation of specific gifts to programs. In most cases, donors accept and understand the reasons for the university’s position on restrictions. Given that there have been concerns, some of the most recent major gifts have been made public, for example the recent Koch donation and the funding for the ASLS.

Cabrera noted that there are specific concerns that have been raised about the nature of temporary gifts that provide support for professors in installments. This has become the norm, despite the preference for donations to be set up as endowments. He acknowledged that some have raised the concern that the donor may pull funding after a few years if they are unhappy
with how the funds are being spent. And he also acknowledged that the university absorbs the cost of professorships after the funding has expired.

Cabrera noted the constructive meeting/conversations with Faculty Senators on Tuesday, May 1, where the discussion of funding professorships was a topic. He noted his support for funding for professorships, as this money provides deans more flexibility in how they spend their funds, allowing for growth across the university. Cabrera acknowledged his own concerns with the old agreements, even though they are not longer active (save one), as they raise fair questions that may lead people to believe we are subject to undue influence. The review he ordered is important because it will allow us to clarify what happened in the past versus what is current practice.

Members of the Faculty Senate provided some suggestions how review should take place:
- Faculty involvement in review – Cabrera agrees.
- External experts – Cabrera agrees.
- To make all gifts public – Cabrera agrees with the underlying philosophy but there may be limits. Most donors don’t mind transparency; in most cases, not a conflict. For donors who wish to remain anonymous, we must accept that. There are legal restrictions to sharing data.
- To determine, to the best of our ability, the impact on our ability to raise funds in the future – this is something all are concerned with.

At Wednesday’s regular BOV meeting, Cabrera narrated the facts and then yielded time to Faculty Senate chair Keith Renshaw, who made a harsh, clear statement that will become part of the BOV record. Cabrera proposed a way forward to dispel doubts, a way to review all agreements which exist. If the review identifies weaknesses, the review would suggest how to correct them (e.g. academic independence and whether any parts of the process need strengthening). The BOV deliberated on Cabrera’s proposal and agreed to some of the faculty’s suggestions. Their recommendation reaffirms university’s commitment to academic independence and freedom. They endorse the review and add to it with two faculty members, a student representative, and to engage external partners as needed. The review committee will report back to the BOV Executive Committee. President Cabrera argued that this is a good, fair resolution that will speak to the issues and will be able to address the process as needed.

Cabrera reiterated a desire to hear from faculty on the review process but called for the university to move forward. He closed with a reminder of the university’s accomplishments.

Questions and Discussion:

A Senator asked whether the BOV also supports expanding the review to gifts supporting graduate students, doctoral dissertation research and centers? A follow up question noted the two recently passed Faculty Senate resolutions and asked about the process to avoid situations like these donor agreements in the future.

President Cabrera said that the review was limited to one specific process because there was no evidence of a need to question all funding processes in the university. If there are other equally bad agreements with donors found, they need to be dealt with but will focus on one process at a time. If there is evidence of other problems, his office and the BOV were not aware of it at this
time. President Cabrera noted he had not yet read the Senate resolutions but intends to do so. The review process will help us clarify next steps.

A Senator asked about the particular donor in question (Charles Koch) as they are part of a larger conversation in the country regarding ideological influence on universities. Does the President see this situation as damaging our reputation and hurting our ability to raise resources in the future?

President Cabrera noted his gratitude to the Charles Koch Foundation for financial support it has given GMU over the years. He would not be supportive of any policy where ideas of donor would not adhere to university policy. We have to be true to academic freedom and freedom of speech at all levels. We need to have credible, strong process so that donors cannot have influence. We dedicate a lot of time to getting donors who support our mission – work which may attract specific ideologies. We would want to attract donors; we don’t want to lose donors.

A Senator asked about the relationship with the donors, that if they are providing money are we in essence doing work for them?

President Cabrera asked for that question to be addressed to Dean Matz but noted that the caliber of the work of the individual faculty members funded by the gifts has been outstanding.

A Senator requested that the faculty members on the review committee be elected faculty members. President Cabrera said he would work with the Faculty Senate chair as he was open to that.

Several Senators asked questions about the motivations of the Kochs, whether they believe in supporting public higher education. Citing recent newspaper reports, one Senator questioned whether they were leveraging certain developments and shrinking public education, and would they be successful in defunding public education? In a follow up question, one Senator also noted that in the meeting with Faculty Senate earlier in the week, the President had been asked about emails between the ASLS Dean and other parties around the question of donor gifts.

President Cabrera noted that others have raised a similar set of questions and theories but that he had no way to know any donor’s intentions as their motivations may be multiple. However, whatever the agreement we sign with a donor, we cannot compromise principles of academic independence. He noted that he was focusing on the gifts at hand and will allow the review process to set future discussions.

A Senator asked for clarification on the statement about anonymous donors as the terms of the donation may be affected when the person requests anonymity. How does this work if we do not know who the donor is?

President Cabrera noted that the GMU Foundation is a private entity, not subject to FOI, the subject of a lawsuit currently ongoing, so will see what courts decide. There are representatives from the university community connected to the Foundation but the GMU Foundation does not have authority to commit agreements with these kinds of expectations.
Chair Renshaw thanked President Cabrera for his time and introduced Interim Dean Robert Matz, College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Dean Matz provided comments: The older agreements (2003-2011) have flaws, providing for improper inputs by donors. The March 2018 agreement was vetted and does not have those kinds of problems. He disagreed that accepting money from donors takes away money from units, arguing that the opposite is true. The gift allows for university funds to be spent to hire faculty in other units. When the funding in the new agreement ends in 5-7 years, Economics will have increased their Master’s program by 50 students, tuition revenues that will support the faculty hires. The old lines were partially covered by tuition revenues and given that Economics is not overstaffed, the cost to cover the enrollments would have existed anyway.

Dean Matz also noted that the faculty in question were highly productive scholars who had gone through the tenure and promotion process, having been vetted by their peers. He discourages faculty to question the hiring and tenuring of colleagues across units. Individuals may disagree with one another’s’ work, but the faculty in question here are engaging in work central to their discipline, not on the fringe, and that work is highly regarded. It is corrosive to call into question the value of faculty work in this manner as it undermines academic independence.

Discussion and Questions:
A Senator noted that the reason people may disagree with the faculty members who were hired because their influence would be over the next 20-30 years, not simply 5 under the agreement.

Dean Matz noted that if faculty are not producing adequate scholarship as judged by their peers, they will not make it through the promotion and tenure process. The old gift agreements were improper but the new agreement holds no such language of improper influence on faculty hires.

Two Senators asked questions about the ideological connections of the Mercatus Center and the faculty connected to it, especially under the old agreements. Dean Matz noted that the Mercatus Center reports to the Provost, not to the Dean of CHSS.

A Faculty Senator asked about the location of the old agreements, why a FOIA request was required to find the old agreements in the college office. Are there not copies in other locations on campus? Dean Matz noted that the copies in the college office were photocopies, not the originals and that he has no idea where other copies, nor the original, are housed.

Chair Renshaw thanked Dean Matz for his time and asked Provost Wu to speak.

Provost Wu provided a brief statement. He noted that the Director of the Mercatus Center reports to him on a yearly basis. They meet on a somewhat regular basis, discussing the academic work connected to the Mercatus Center, e.g., publications. Provost Wu discussed academic freedom and that to protect that freedom, debate must be protected rather than silenced.
II. Questions and Answers

Questions posed by the Faculty Senate

Chair Renshaw presented a series of formal motions. A request was made to distribute the comments Chair Renshaw made to the BOV that people can sign on to. No objections were made.

Motions Related to Recently Released Gift Agreements

**MOTION FOR REVIEW OF GIFT AGREEMENTS AND GIFT ACCEPTANCE PRACTICES AND POLICIES**

Whereas recently released Gift Agreements raise strong concerns about whether other university Gift Agreements violate academic independence and academic integrity,

Therefore, be it resolved that:

The Faculty Senate calls on the University to undertake a comprehensive review of:

1. All existing Gift Agreements that support faculty positions, student scholarships, or academic programs or curriculum; and
2. Current gift acceptance practices and policies at the University.

This review will be conducted by a Task Force with representatives from the Board of Visitors, the Administration, the student body, and faculty. Faculty representatives shall be elected by the Faculty and be at least equal in number to the representatives of any other group.

One or more people from an external 3rd party entity that is independent of the University will participate in the review. They will be chosen by the Task Force and their selection must be approved by the faculty representatives.

The task force will review:

1. Gift Agreements supporting any of the following:
   a. Current or future faculty positions
   b. Current or future faculty fellowships or student scholarships
   c. Current or future academic programs or curricula

2. Gift acceptance policies and practices at the university, with the object of recommending changes that guard against infringements of both academic independence and academic integrity.

Among other considerations, this comprehensive review should address: (i) the long-term costs and other implications of using gifts with short-term funding to create enduring faculty positions and (ii) the potential implications for academic freedom and integrity of gifts funded in installments, where continued funding is contingent upon satisfying donors that their gifts are serving the donors’ interests.

The motion was approved.

**MOTION TO PAUSE FUNDING OF GIFTS WITH TEMPORARY SUPPORT OF PERMANENT POSITIONS**
**Whereas** it may be common practice to use temporary philanthropic funds to support the creation of permanent, tenure-line positions, but the long-term implications of this practice are currently unknown;

**Therefore, be it resolved that:**

The Faculty Senate recommends that the University put a temporary halt on any actual or planned expenditure of funds from any gifts of this nature, including but not limited to the recent gift from the Charles Koch Foundation to the Department of Economics, until an external review of all gift acceptance processes is concluded, and further information and recommendations are available regarding the use of temporary funds to support permanent faculty positions at the University.

**Discussion:** Some Senators objected to placing a temporary halt to funding allocated to faculty in place, as there is a need to keep paying faculty. An amendment was moved and seconded to insert “new” into the motion before the word “gifts” in the second line. Discussion on the amendment asked whether it would put new funds in jeopardy. Another amendment was moved and seconded to delete “including but not limited to the recent gift from the Charles Koch Foundation to the Department of Economics.” The amendments were both approved.

The amended motion to be discussed was: “Therefore, be it resolved that:
The Faculty Senate recommends that the University put a temporary halt on any actual or planned expenditure of funds from any new gifts of this nature, until an external review of all gift acceptance processes is concluded, and further information and recommendations are available regarding the use of temporary funds to support permanent faculty positions at the University.”

Senators discussing the amended motion reported concerns about the lack of specificity in the motion, because it is asking the university to put pauses on gifts when we have no idea of impact on gifts, costs. Other Senators opposed the motion as an intellectual witch hunt, also asking what was meant by “temporary”? Dean Matz was very uncomfortable with the prospect of the Faculty Senate restricting funds in the college. The motion as amended was approved, 17 in favor, 13 opposed.

**MOTION TO ASSESSE THE IMPACTS OF PERCEPTIONS OF DONOR INFLUENCE**

The Faculty Senate calls on the administration to work with faculty on the following: (a) a survey of alumni to understand their perceptions of donors and influence at George Mason University, and how those perceptions affect their willingness to financially support Mason development initiatives, and (b) a survey of current and prior donors regarding the same.

**Discussion:** Senators asked whether it was possible to get a representative sample of alumni as there would likely be a problem of selection bias. Senators expressed support for hearing from alumni but were concerned about how the data would be used. Some Senators were concerned that this kind of motion as not in the purview of the Faculty Senate. An amendment was made and withdrawn; the question was closed.

The motion was not approved.

A motion was made and seconded to postpone adjournment. The motion was approved.

Senator Bethany Letiecq made the following prepared remarks:

In order to move forward, we also must redress the past. I derive no pleasure in introducing these motions.
As you may recall, on February 9, 2011, the Faculty Senate formed a task force to examine the Agreements between George Mason University and Private Donors.

On June 28, 2011, when asked about gift agreements post the Florida State Scandal, Peter Stearns stated to Inside Higher Ed that we were not doing that at Mason.

On Sept 8, 2011, in an email to Dave Kuebrich, Provost Stearns said, “I also assure you that I have examined all endowment agreements, including the one that involves Koch: in no case do they allow for interference with standard procedures. Like you, I was troubled by reports of what places like Florida State seemed to have agreed to; we're not involved with anything of the sort.”

About the same time, a student group calling themselves Transparent GMU was forming and educating themselves about these gift agreements.

On September 5, 2014, in response to an open letter written by alumni Colin Nackerman and Samantha Parsons (Founders of Transparent GMU), President Cabrera wrote on his Presidential blog “our donors, no matter how generous, are not allowed to choose the student who receives the scholarship, the professor that is hired, or the scholarship a faculty member produces.”

On September 10, 2014, when questioned about Koch influence during a Reddit “Ask Me Anything interview,” President Cabrera put the burden of proof on his students by responding with “do you have evidence that any of our donors may be exercising undue influence?”

From 2011 to the present, faculty, students and the public have been asking about donor influence here. AND EACH TIME WE WERE REBUFFED, STYMIED, REASSURED…and sometimes made to feel like conspiracy theorists.

Now we know we were on to something and it took all of those years and SO MANY FOIA requests to finally get the university to be responsive to our search for these agreements.

AND DURING ALL OF THIS TIME, Peter Stearns, Alan Merten, Jack Censor, Daniele Struppa, and Tyler Cowen knew the agreements did exist, that donors were sharing decision making power over faculty hiring and firing, and held influence over faculty scholarship.

AND NOT ONE OF THESE INDIVIDUALS CAME FORWARD TO SAY, “actually, Mr. President, we do have these agreements….they are sitting in a file cabinet over in CHSS.”

So President Cabrera (and Janet Bingham in her role as development officer for our university) perpetuated these denials. And rather than conducting an investigation, they refused to listen to student and faculty concerns and take any actions….and we still haven’t even begun to examine the agreements over at the Foundation where from 2011 to 2014 Koch gave nearly $50 million to Mason. So we are still seeking answers to our questions about donor influence here.

Today, it is with a heavy heart, that we bring these motions forward to censure the signatories of the agreements.
Because all signatories had to have known that those agreements violated academic freedom and because those agreements compromised the reputation of our institution, we believe they should be held accountable for those betrayals of the public trust, of our trust.

**MOTION FOR CENSURE OF PETER STEARNS**

WHEREAS Peter Stearns, serving as Provost of George Mason University from January 2000 to June 2014, had the duty to maintain institutional academic independence;

WHEREAS then-Provost Stearns signed separate documents on July 14, 2003 [FOIA 1], four times on June 6, 2007 [FOIA 2, 3, 4, 5], twice on August 1, 2007 [FOIA 6, 7], and finally on August 13, 2009 [FOIA 8] that enable financial donors to directly influence the selection of faculty into the University's academic community;

WHEREAS these documents were withheld from public distribution, and their existence and release has been damaging to the reputation of the University and undermined the academic character of its Faculty;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate censures Peter Stearns for his actions as gross violations of academic freedom and institutional management.

**Discussion:**
Professor Peter Stearns spoke on his own behalf. In his comments he spoke in support of clarification of standards concerning donor reps on search committees as they would have been useful in the past. He noted that responses to FOIA requests were not necessarily something that was in the role of the Provost; this was also the case for the storage of documents, which Legal should monitor. Stearns said that he never consciously lied about donor arrangements, and did publicly note occasional membership on search committees. He expressed frustration that individuals who were being censured had been criticized without an opportunity to provide a response and called any action during the meeting as unfair and inappropriate.

**MOTION FOR CENSURE OF TYLER COWEN**

WHEREAS Tyler Cowen, Holbert L. Harris Professor of Economics, while serving as Faculty Director of the Mercatus Center at George Mason University since 1998, had the duty to maintain and uphold standards of academic independence;

WHEREAS Director Cowen signed separate documents on July 14, 2003 [FOIA 1], four times on June 6, 2007 [FOIA 2, 3, 4, 5], twice on August 1, 2007 [FOIA 6, 7], and finally on August 13, 2009 [FOIA 8] that enabled financial donors to directly influence the selection into and/or removal of faculty from the University's academic community and to directly influence faculty and student research production;

WHEREAS Professor Cowen’s facilitation of these agreements has been damaging to the reputation of the University and undermined the academic character of its Faculty;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate censures Tyler Cowen for his actions as gross violations of academic freedom.
Professor Cowen’s response, which was provided to the university community before the Senate meeting, is posted on the Faculty Senate website at http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/Mercatus%20Responses.pdf.

A motion was made and seconded that the motions of censure for all current or past University-affiliated signatories of the released gift agreements from 2003-2011 be postponed to allow for gathering of more information, and to allow adequate time for a thorough reply for each individual named in the motions. A second motion was made and seconded to vote in a block on the motions of censure. The motion to combine was approved. The motion for postponement was approved.

**MOTION FOR CENSURE OF DANIELE C. STRUPPA RELATING TO GIFT AGREEMENTS**

WHEREAS Daniele Struppa, serving as the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at George Mason University in 2003, had the duty to maintain institutional academic independence;

WHEREAS then-Dean Struppa signed a document on July 14, 2003 [FOIA 1] that enabled financial donors to directly influence the selection of faculty into the University's academic community;

WHEREAS this document was withheld from public distribution, and its existence and release has been damaging to the reputation of the University and undermined the academic character of its Faculty;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate censures Daniele Struppa for his actions as gross violations of academic freedom and institutional management.

**MOTION FOR CENSURE OF JACK CENSER RELATING TO GIFT AGREEMENTS**

WHEREAS Jack Censer, serving as the Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences at George Mason University during the years 2007-2009, had the duty to maintain institutional academic independence;

WHEREAS then-Dean Censer signed four separate documents on June 6, 2007 [FOIA 2, 3, 4, 5], twice on July 31, 2007 [FOIA 6, 7], and finally on August 10, 2009 [FOIA 8] that enable financial donors to directly influence the selection of faculty into the University's academic community;

WHEREAS these documents were withheld from public distribution, and their existence and release has been damaging to the reputation of the University and undermined the academic character of its Faculty;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate censures Jack Censer for his actions as gross violations of academic freedom and institutional management.

**MOTION FOR CENSURE OF ALAN MERTEN RELATING TO GIFT AGREEMENTS**

WHEREAS Alan Merten, serving as the President of George Mason University in 2007, had the duty to maintain institutional academic independence;

WHEREAS then-President Merten signed a document on August 7, 2007 [FOIA 7] that enabled financial donors to directly influence the selection of faculty into the University's academic community;
WHEREAS this document was withheld from public distribution, and its existence and release has been damaging to the reputation of the University and undermined the academic character of its Faculty;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate censures Alan Merten for his actions as gross violations of academic freedom and institutional management.

Chair Keith Renshaw thanked everyone for taking the time to attend, and for their participation. The Senators thanked Keith for his leadership.

III. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 11:18 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Shannon N. Davis
Secretary