

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
AGENDA FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
APRIL 24, 2019
Robinson Hall B113, 3:00-4:15 p.m.

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of the Minutes of April 3, 2019

III. Announcements

Rector Davis
Provost Wu

IV. Special Orders

Election of Faculty Senate Chair 2019-20

V. Committee Reports

A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee
Academic Policies
Budget and Resources
Faculty Matters
Nominations
Organization and Operations

[Link to annual report](#)

[Link to annual report](#)

[Link to annual report](#)

[Link to annual report](#)

[Link to annual report](#)

B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

Effective Teaching Committee

Student Evaluation of Teaching Draft Form Revision

[Attachment A](#)

Motion from the Committee

[Attachment B](#)

Multilingual Academic Support Committee

Gift Acceptance Policy Implementation Task Force

Annual Faculty Senate Evaluation of President/Provost

[Attachment C](#)

Annual Reports

Academic Appeals

[Link to annual report](#)

Academic Initiatives

[Link to annual report/INTO](#)

Admissions

[Link to annual report](#)

Adult Learning & Executive Education

[Link to annual report](#)

Athletic Council

[Link to annual report](#)

Effective Teaching

[Link to annual report](#)

External Academic Relations

[Link to annual report](#)

Faculty Equity and Inclusion

[Link to annual report](#)

Faculty Handbook

[Link to annual report](#)

Grievance

[Link to annual report](#)

Mason Core

[Link to annual report](#)

Multilingual Academic Support	Link to annual report
Recreation Advisory	Link to annual report
Research Advisory Committee	Link to annual report
Salary Equity Study	Link to annual report
Technology Policy	Link to annual report
University Promotion, Tenure, and Renewal Appeal	Link to annual report
Writing Across the Curriculum	Link to annual report
Ad Hoc Institutional COI	Link to annual report

VI. Unfinished Business

Additional Gift Acceptance Policy Motion #2 (postponed) [Attachment D](#)

VII. New Business

VIII. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty

In Memoriam – Tom Kiley [Attachment E](#)

IX. Adjournment

George Mason University Course Evaluation Form



Course Title (e.g., HIST 101 001) _____ Instructor's

Name _____

Student Information

1) What is your class level?	<input type="radio"/> Fresh.	<input type="radio"/> Soph.	<input type="radio"/> Junior	<input type="radio"/> Senior	<input type="radio"/> Mast.	<input type="radio"/> Doct.	<input type="radio"/> Other	
2) For your plan of study, this course is:	<input type="radio"/> a required course	<input type="radio"/> elective course				<input type="radio"/> Mason Core/ general education course	<input type="radio"/> Other	
3) What is the class format/delivery?	<input type="radio"/> Face-to-face	<input type="radio"/> Hybrid	<input type="radio"/> Online					
4) How many times were you absent from class sessions?	<input type="radio"/> 0-1	<input type="radio"/> 2-3	<input type="radio"/> 4-5	<input type="radio"/> 6-7	<input type="radio"/> 8 or more	<input type="radio"/> N/A		
5) On average, how many hours per week outside of class did you spend preparing for this class?	<input type="radio"/> 1-3	<input type="radio"/> 4-6	<input type="radio"/> 7-9	<input type="radio"/> 10 or more hours				
6) What grade do you expect in this course?	<input type="radio"/> A	<input type="radio"/> B	<input type="radio"/> C	<input type="radio"/> D	<input type="radio"/> F	<input type="radio"/> Pass	<input type="radio"/> Fail	<input type="radio"/> Other

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

Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 Neither Agree nor Disagree
 Agree
 Strongly Agree
 N/A or Unknown

Student Participation

7) I completed all assigned tasks before each class.	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ○
8) I consistently contributed to class activities/discussions.	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ○

Learning Outcomes

9) I gained an understanding of the main concepts in this course.	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ○
10) I learned through the variety of learning opportunities (e.g. assignments, projects, papers, discussions, group work, peer review, exams) provided.	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ○
11) I found the instructor's feedback helpful for learning.	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ○
12) I learned due to the instructor's teaching methods/style.	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ○

Course Environment/Experiences

13) The instructor created an environment that facilitated my engagement with course content.	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ○
14) The instructor encouraged expression of diverse perspectives.	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ○
15) The instructor offered opportunities for students to provide feedback on the course.	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ○
16) The instructor offered opportunities to meet outside of class time, such as virtual or in-person office hours.	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ○
17) The instructor used technologies and/or resources/tools that increased my engagement with course content.	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ○

Instructor Preparation and Course Organization

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

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!

SAMPLE ITEMS FACULTY MAY CHOOSE TO ADD

Technology Use

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Navigation throughout the online components of the course was appropriate for the complexity of the course. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |
| 2) The course directed students to technology resources to help them succeed in an online learning environment. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |

3) To what extent did the technology used in this course (e.g., Blackboard, synchronous learning, discussion board, Wikis) facilitate your learning?

Revised February 21, 2019

Attachment B

Motion to the Faculty Senate - April 3, 2019

1. 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.

Attachment C

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

Attachment D

Motion #2

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. The vote of the faculty senate shall determine review processes under these circumstances.

The motion was amended to remove the last sentence: "The vote of the FS shall determine review processes under these circumstances." The amendment was approved. A second amendment, "with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to determine the best way to present the issue to the Faculty Senate" was added to the penultimate sentence. The amendment was approved.

The motion as amended reads:

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.

The Senate voted to postpone further discussion on this motion to move to the elections of members to the Implementation Task Force, before the end of the meeting.

Attachment E

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.

We request that Tom Kiley's contributions to the University and the Faculty Senate be recognized by including these remarks in the Minutes of this meeting.