I. **Call to Order:** Chair Shannon Davis called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

II. **Approval of the Minutes of September 4, 2019:** The minutes were approved.

III. **Conversation with Rector Davis**

The presidential search has been initiated with Chair of the Faculty Senate Shannon Davis and Vice Rector Jimmy Hazel serving as co-chairs of the search committee. Rector Davis stated that faculty are full partners in this process, and that they aim to get input from various stakeholders across the university by holding listening sessions.

Chair Shannon Davis: The communications team is currently working on the final edits to the presidential search website. The presidential search steering committee will be reviewing the website in detail in order to ensure accuracy, completeness, and create a good impression. After reviewers have approved the website, it will take up to 24 hours for it to be accessible to the public. The presidential search ad will appear in multiple sites (10), with descriptions available; and a formal announcement will be made when it goes public. The entire university community is invited to participate in conversation.
Rector Davis:

- With sudden departure of President Cabrera, selection of an interim president had to be done quickly. He approached Anne Holton, former Secretary of Education of the state of Virginia, to serve in this role. She has been an important asset in making a case with state legislators and governor.
- Mason has received lesser funds compared with other universities on per student basis. He also expressed his displeasure with state funding disparity between Virginia Tech and GMU with respect to Amazon.
- Mason is transitioning more courses online, to strengthen online offerings and make it more affordable for students. As plans get a little more definitive, they will be shared with the faculty.
- The discussion on Medical School presence is at embryonic stage.
- We have furthered our relationship with community college (NVCC). We may adopt similar arrangements in DC. DC Residents currently pay in-state tuition at out-of-state universities, with private funding to supplement. We are looking into this as a way to attract students from DC to Mason.
- We are looking into enhancing relationship with Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Technology (TJHSST). Currently in discussion, for the students to take classes at Mason.
- Presidential Search: Faculty members elected 1 individual, and Faculty Senate chair. Diverse community representation on the search committee. But most important, Faculty Senate Chair is one of two co-chairs running this lengthy discussion of what priorities are looking for a new president.

A Senator expressed concern for the lack of faculty input and public scrutiny of the finalist candidates because of “closed search”. The Senator read from the GMU Faculty Handbook (Section 1.2.5, p. 10) regarding faculty participation on presidential search committees, and:

**1.2.5 Faculty Participation in the Selection of Certain Members of the Central Administration**

The faculty plays a vital role in the appointment and reappointment of senior academic administrators and other leadership positions related to the academic mission of the university.

The Board of Visitors provides for participation on presidential search committees by faculty who are elected by the General Faculty. The search and selection process must include opportunities for the General Faculty to meet with candidates who are finalists for the presidency. The Board of Visitors also provides for participation in the process of presidential reappointments or contract extensions by faculty who are elected by the General Faculty. This process includes an opportunity for the General Faculty to meet with the President to discuss his or her achievements and future plans for the university.

Rector Davis: The Faculty Handbook and by-laws are superseded by state laws and code. He expressed his own concerns that some highly qualified applicants would be reluctant to be outed, concerned that their identities may be leaked to the press. He reassured the Senate that the Board wants to attract the best, brightest, and most diverse group of candidates in the search. He also expressed the problem of how to structure it? It is for this reason, he decided to have Faculty Chair of Senate Shannon Davis and Vice Rector Hazel co-chair the search.
Senator: Emphasized that BOV must also adhere to the Faculty Handbook as a set of obligations that are agreed upon. Reporting shows that consulting groups designed presidential searches protect the candidates not the universities. The lack of public scrutiny has been found to be not helpful and other universities have abandoned closed searches for this reason.

Rector Davis doesn’t share the same concerns and believes that it is Board’s fiduciary responsibility to attract best pool of candidates for the position.

Senator: There are plenty of examples of other universities attracting excellent candidates with public vetting as part of the process. The AAUP Chapter of GMU is demanding a public search and engagement to ensure a public and transparent process.

Rector Davis: This will be a more transparent process: four town hall sessions to solicit input from all stakeholders, but will not jeopardize someone’s job because they apply.

Follow up: Understands confidentiality up to a point. Public scrutiny, public vetting BOV wants your input. With all due respect, Shannon Davis is one person.

Rector Davis: If you can protect confidentiality to do a town hall meeting about this thing, to take it up with the BOV, not his decision.

Senator: Hears your concerns about privacy. Re-emphasizes that faculty would also like the best possible candidate for President. Does not see how it got so contentious. Suggests inclusion of a few more faculty voices in the search committee – someone from AAUP could be very helpful. This would offer more faculty a voice and may resolve problems by requiring they sign a confidentiality agreement.

Rector Davis: We had 4-5 meetings on campus, received suggestions from faculty, staff, alumni, etc. There are 19 people on the search committee, and last time there were 30. Of the 19, there are three faculty representatives.

Follow up: Three of 19 doesn’t feel adequate.

Rector Davis: Inquired what ratio would faculty prefer? Given that there are four sets of stakeholders: donors, faculty, staff and students, each with their representation on the search committee,

Chair Davis noted the GMU Foundation has one representative.

Rector Davis: The BOV has to have representatives on it: 9 BOV members: they make the final decision. The same is true at the University of Virginia and at William and Mary.

Senator: Candidates seeking confidentiality and secrecy are more likely to care more about their career than have the necessary strength of character. Open forums and public scrutiny can serve to only strengthen the search.

Rector Davis: Disagrees and believes the risk of limiting the pool of candidates is significant. With elected representation from faculty, suggests communicating with faculty representatives on the committee.

Faculty Senate Chair Shannon Davis: WE have to do something to facilitate a full community-wide, all stakeholders: Faculty, staff, students, Fairfax community and others with vested interest in having this conversation. Asks everyone to please share specific examples with her so she can share it with the committee.

Rector Davis: wants faculty’s total involvement, but how to get there is open for discussion. To say “open search” from day one would limit pool of applicants. Some BOV members not willing to sign non-disclosure.
Faculty Senate Chair Shannon Davis: We did not sign non-disclosure; we signed a Code of Ethics taken from other organizations.

Senator: Requests update on fund raising $125M as part of the initiatives related to Amazon HQ2?
Rector Davis: Some money has been raised and in in the pipeline. We are in discussion with the state to get timeline for fundraising be increased from 3 to 10 years. This would also help address other priorities.

IV. Unfinished Business
A. Technology Policy Committee – Annual Report 2018-19 [Link to report]
Questions/Discussion
A Senator asked about the BYOD ( Bring your own device) policies. He would like to see a review of current classrooms and equipment.
Senator Catherine Sausville, co-chair: New buildings will not have full equipment hookups in them. There will be resources available.
What is the rationale?
Senator Sausville: Classrooms in Robinson more like active learning, mobile, not to manage all these computers.

B. Criminal Background Checks Report – Jessica Cain, Human Resources Background Check Consultant provided information at the request of the Faculty Senate each year. There were no terminations or failed background checks for faculty for the third year in a row. [Link to report]

C. Honor Committee Report – La Shonda Anthony, Director, Academic Integrity [Attachment A]
Questions/Discussion: How to handle cases of plagiarism that is contracted out? 3rd party contractor often reports the plagiarism when financial transaction goes sour. How do you deal with the contractors?
Response: There are no legal vehicles to deal with it.
Response: Students used access many (almost all) of the questions.
Senator: The bookstore is promoting Bartleby [https://www.bartleby.com/] which provides access to solutions manuals to the textbooks.
Response: Did not know about it.

V. Committee Reports
A. Senate Standing Committees
Executive Committee – Shannon Davis, Chair
[Use of GMU Domain Name by Affiliates of George Mason University] was included on the September 4th meeting agenda. A few Faculty Senators asked questions and have provided detailed and meaningful feedback. The feedback is being taken into consideration by the Executive Committee and the final report will incorporate these before reporting to the Faculty Senate.

Lester Arnold, Vice President of Human Resources/Payroll presented an update on the [Faculty Conduct Working Group – Procedure Review].
Questions/Discussion
Senator: Compliance issues, certain legal issues, such as sanctions against faculty or people not in compliance. We have a lot of lawyers in the Antonin Scalia Law School and on the faculty.

VP Arnold: No, we have general counsel. We are in the process of finalizing document.

Senator Bethany Letiecq, Chair of Faculty Matters Committee and President of the GMU AAUP Chapter: Expessed that faculty should have a lot more say in the process. Highlighted the presence of a “Free Speech Policy” on the web which includes “report bias” button to file a report. Once button gets pushed, faculty’s due process rights, grievance procedures, and investigations, are not in accord with the Faculty Handbook. Critically, “Free Speech” is not the same as “academic freedom” and offers to work with implementation of improved policies that balance academic freedom, free speech and due process.

Senator: Not a parallel, traditional means of grievance committees in colleges, departments, and at Faculty Senate level. Does not see any place of inclusion of Faculty Senate University Grievance Committee in discussion of these processes. The Faculty Senate University Grievance Committee members. Where is the representative of an already existing committee here for many years?

VP Arnold: There are two different bodies/processes.

Senator: The Grievance Committee is currently deliberately left out so it can independently execute its charge. The Grievance Committee reports to university.

Senator: If someone on Grievance Committee had conflict of interest

VP Arnold: Not at all, sees as a separate process

Senator: People who first found out about these cases – we did our own background work on the Executive Committee. Three members (Shannon Davis, Suzanne Slayden and Girum Urgessa) and others met over the summer beginning in July.

Chair Davis: We were in the process of working on these documents, not finalized yet. There will be many “eyes” on this.

VP Arnold: We learned about gaps and concerns; to do a really good job to document and be transparent in the process. Grievance as a totally separate process. Anticipate decisions made once process is executed.

Chair Davis: Perceived inconsistencies in policies/procedures, implications of inconsistencies. Processes developed clearly spell out roles everyone is in. Not to say Grievance Committee – lack of clarity about relationships, strive for clarity, transparency from all sides of process. To make sure everyone in this interaction understands how process will proceed, to hold as accountable when the information becomes publicly available.

Senator: People can call state hotline on fraud, waste, and abuse.

VP Arnold: All reports to the state are required to be investigated by university and run through our internal process.

---

**Academic Policies - Suzanne Slayden, Chair**

**Academic Policies Committee**

**Agenda Item for Faculty Senate Meeting, Oct. 2, 2019**

**Background:** Many new students are entering the university with credit for AP, IB, and dual-enrollment courses. The current academic standing categories are based on credit levels. Students who bring in such credit (yet are still in first year at Mason) and who do not do well in their first two semesters, can fall into a probationary category given the number of credits they’ve brought in (hence skipping the “warning” phase). When on probation they are not allowed to participate in university-sponsored activities – this has a significant impact on some areas such as athletics, debate, and student government.
This is the current catalog language:

**AP.5.2.3 Student Retention Categories**

Students with at least 7 attempted credits and a cumulative GPA of less than 2.00 fall into one of three categories: warning, probation, and suspension. All notations of academic standing are included in a student’s permanent record. The cumulative GPA range that defines each of the categories varies according to the credit level, as noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Level</th>
<th>Warning</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Credit Hours:</td>
<td>Cumulative GPA Range:</td>
<td>Cumulative GPA Range:</td>
<td>Cumulative GPA Range:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-16</td>
<td>0.00-1.99</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-29</td>
<td>1.75-1.99</td>
<td>1.00-1.74</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-59</td>
<td>1.85-1.99</td>
<td>1.25-1.84</td>
<td>0.00-1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-89</td>
<td>1.95-1.99</td>
<td>1.55-1.94</td>
<td>0.00-1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1.85-1.99</td>
<td>0.00-1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exception for Freshmen and Transfer Students**

Freshmen and transfer students in their first semester of study at Mason will receive probation as the strongest academic sanction. GPA retention levels, as stated above, will apply in all subsequent semesters. Students in this category should be on notice that they must improve their academic record to avoid suspension in future semesters; in particular they should consult their advisors and consider repeating courses to achieve academic good standing.

**Motion:**

The Academic Policies Committee recommends the catalog language be changed to read (changes in underlined italics):

Students with at least 7 attempted credits completed at Mason and a cumulative GPA of less than 2.00 fall into one of three categories: warning, probation, and suspension. All notations of academic standing are included in a student’s permanent record. Students who plan to apply for financial aid should review the requirements for making Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP), as found on the Financial Aid website, which differ from Academic Standing. The cumulative GPA range that defines each of the categories varies according to the credit level, as noted below:

**Example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Credits at Admission</th>
<th>Credits completed at GMU</th>
<th>Total Attempted Credits</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Standing Now</th>
<th>Standing Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New student</td>
<td>(AP) 9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Suspension (Probation for 1st semester)</td>
<td>Warning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no further discussion and the motion was approved.
**Budget and Resources - Tim Leslie, Chair**

We are continuing to follow the implementation of the Incentive-Based Budget Model. A focus by central administration this year is the improvement of documentation and refinement of the base assumptions. Because of these changes, data release on the values from the 2018-19 AY will likely be delayed by several months.

**Faculty Matters – Bethany Letiecq, Chair**

We are working on the Faculty Evaluation of Administrators and also looking at pilot chair evaluation, free speech policies, and study leave.

**Nominations – no report.**

**Organization and Operations – Lisa Billingham, Chair**

Shannon Davis and I have been meeting with Lester Arnold and other members of Human Resources, currently working on reporting structure, funding structure for ombudsperson. We do have liaison structure if we decide to use it. A long process, she also thanked the administrators. We will review all standing committee charges this year.

**B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives**

**Mason Core Committee – Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Chair**

The Mason Core was established nearly 20 years ago and is the core education experience that is shared by all Mason students who enter as first-year students. Since then, we have been making small gradual changes to keep the Core updated. However, the Core is intended to be a transformative learning experience that includes the knowledge, skills, and experiences that we want all Mason students to have, regardless of discipline. We are currently at the end of a complete assessment cycle, and since the curriculum is the purview of the faculty, we want to take a year to get input from faculty to think together about what the Mason Core should look like moving forward. Samaine Lockwood (jlockwo3@gmu.edu) has been hired as the Faculty Fellow for the Mason Core, and she is going to be spending this year listening to and getting input from faculty to find out what is going well, what isn’t, and what we might be able to do better for our students. There will be a series of three Core Conversations. The first was held during the Innovations in Teaching and Learning Conference in September, and the next two are listed below:

1. Monday, October 21, 10:30-11:45 a.m. at the George in the Johnson Center
2. Thursday, November 14, 3:00 – 4:00 p.m. at the Hub, rooms 3-4-5.

Additionally, Dr. Lockwood will be holding focus groups with faculty, staff, and students and collecting survey feedback. For more information, please reach out to Dr. Lockwood or visit the Mason Core website.

**Effective Teaching Committee – Tom Wood, Chair**

Two members of the Effective Teaching Committee (ETC) met with and Gesele Durham, Associate Provost for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning (OIEP), Angela Detlev, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, and Faculty Senate Chair, Shannon Davis, on September 20.
The Faculty Senate SET Pilot authorized and requested by the Senate in Spring 2019 will take place in the spring of 2020. A stratified sample of 300 hybrid, face-to-face courses and online courses will be used for the Faculty Senate SET pilot. More details on the sampling procedure, communication plans, and overall strategy will be presented at the November Faculty Senate meeting.

VI. New Business
GMU Chapter of the AAUP Resolution on Presidential Searches – Senator Bethany Letiecq

Paper copies of the resolution were distributed to Senators before the meeting began. Senator Letiecq noted (see earlier discussion with Rector Davis on the presidential search) that the resolution upholds the GMU Faculty Handbook Section 1.2.5 Faculty Participation in the Selection of Certain Members of the Central Administration. Some editing changes were suggested. As a point of order, a Senator noted there is a great deal here to debate and students will use the classroom in a few minutes. A motion was made and seconded to postpone debate until the next (November 6, 2019) meeting. Another Senator noted this is very important, we need to have a full understanding and would really like to hear both sides. The motion to table the debate until the next meeting was approved by a vote of 22 in favor, 11 opposed. The motion will be added to the November 6th meeting agenda.

VII. Announcements
- Faculty Database/Infrastructure Investment Event: Wednesday, October 16, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m., Johnson Center Cinema.
- Student Experience Redesign Town Hall: Wednesday, October 30, 12:00 – 3:00 p.m., Dewberry Hall
- Presidential Search Community Session, Wednesday, October 30, 3:30-5:00 p.m., Merten Hall, rm. 1201
- General Faculty Meeting – Wednesday, January 29, 2020, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m., Johnson Center Cinema
- We have been invited to send a representative to the Staff Senate. The Executive Committee are unable to attend due to teaching and departmental meetings. The Staff Senate meets the first Wednesday of the month at 10:30a. If you are interested in this volunteer role as a visitor to the Staff Senate, please let Chair Davis know as soon as possible.

VIII. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty – none.

IX. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kumar Mehta  
Secretary
Honor Code and System Updates 2019-2020 Academic Year

Changes for 2019-2020

- Blackboard site will no longer be accepting referrals. All referrals should be submitted online via our website oai.gmu.edu (select Refer a Case Here) in the menu box)
Changes for 2019-2020

- Classified staff members with Master’s degrees will be eligible to join the Honor Committee. This change was included to acknowledge individuals who have a knowledge base but whose role may not fall under administrative faculty.
- To address concerns with regard to repeat violations not being dealt with appropriately, the code is changing to indicate that suspension will be added to any second violation. A student may choose a sanctions only hearing to see if the committee is willing to remove that sanction as an outcome.
- Decisions during in person hearings will be delivered via email in the letter as opposed to in the hearing. This allows students who may need translation services to fully understand the outcome and process it. This also addresses the concern faculty members had with leaving hearings at the same time as students when hearings may have been contentious.

Changes for 2019-2020

- The Academic Integrity module is available on our website for professor use with courses. It outlines the system at Mason and provides tips for how to avoid concerns. We have a Blackboard version available for students who use Assistive Technology-contact our office with the student's name and G number for enrollment.
Changes for 2019-2020

-The Avoiding Plagiarism Seminar has a system update that requires a new token as of June 2019. Please contact our office or Rebecca Hartley in ORIA for more information.
Attachment B

George Mason University Chapter of the AAUP
Resolution on Presidential Searches

September 29, 2019

Background

In 2012, when Ángel Cabrera was named President of George Mason University by the Board of Visitors (BOV), he had not been vetted by the faculty, students, staff, or the broader Virginia community he would serve. Indeed, his installation was in direct violation of the GMU Faculty Handbook, which states:

“The faculty plays a vital role in the appointment and reappointment of senior academic administrators and other leadership positions related to the academic mission of the university. The Board of Visitors provides for participation on presidential search committees by faculty who are elected by the General Faculty. The search and selection process must include opportunities for the General Faculty to meet with candidates who are finalists for the presidency…” (1.2.5 Faculty Participation in the Selection of Certain Members of the Central Administration)

When members of the Faculty Senate protested being shut out of the presidential search process by the BOV, they were told that the BOV did not have to abide by the Faculty Handbook. The actions of the BOV thwarted any commitments to shared governance and were in direct contradiction of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP)’s recommendation on Presidential Searches:

“The AAUP thus calls upon colleges and universities to resist calls for closed, secretive searches and reaffirm their commitment to transparency and active faculty engagement in the hiring of higher administrative officers. Faculty members should demand that their institutions observe established norms of shared governance by involving faculty representatives in all stages of the search process and by providing the entire faculty and other members of the campus community the opportunity to meet with search finalists in public on campus.”

The AAUP also offers a checklist on searches here: https://www.aaup.org/issues/governance-colleges-universities/presidential-search

According to a 2019 article published by Inside Higher Education, in recent years one of the greatest points of contention between faculty members and their institutions’ governing boards has been over the increasing secrecy of presidential searches and selection processes. The identities of potential candidates are kept under wraps until a sole finalist is brought forward or an appointee is announced. Under either circumstance, the faculty and community at large are excluded from the process.
Governing boards typically rely on executive search firms to carry out presidential searches, which increases the secrecy of the search. These firms often require members of the search committee, including faculty, to sign confidentiality and/or non-disclosure agreements, arguing that it is the only way to recruit talented candidates. Under such secret proceedings, candidates do not have to face public scrutiny and the community at large is not able to participate in candidate vetting. Research suggests that search firms may also not be held accountable to do their own vetting and due diligence to ensure final candidates are in good standing and not embroiled in controversies or engaged in activities that would compromise their ability to lead.

Jan Greenwood, partner and president of Greenwood/ Asher & Associates Inc. has been contracted by the GMU BOV to conduct our current presidential search. Recently, she said that search firms “themselves benefit from a search being open. A known candidate is vetted in a more public manner, by the news media and people on campus. And that scrutiny can help protect a search firm by preventing a bad hire or from not getting necessary background information on a job candidate to the hiring committee.”

Secret searches not only violate the most basic tenet of the university—shared governance—but also compromise the future success of the finalist because of the lack of trust and support among the university community engendered by a secretive, BOV-only process.

According to the 2016 and 2017 annual “Faculty Evaluation of Administrators,” only 38% of participating Mason faculty felt that President Cabrera effectively addressed the concerns of the faculty, and only 36% thought Cabrera was transparent in his actions and decision-making. In the 2018 survey, only 39% of faculty felt President Cabrera did enough to involve faculty in important decision-making.

Per this resolution, we demand that all finalists for the position of President of George Mason University must be subjected to a public search where faculty, staff, students, and the community-at-large can adequately vet and scrutinize the finalists during a public forum and provide feedback to the Board of Visitors.
September 29, 2019

Resolution of the GMU Chapter of the AAUP Regarding Presidential Search

WHEREAS the GMU Faculty Handbook states that “The search and selection process must include opportunities for the General Faculty to meet with candidates who are finalists for the presidency…” (1.2.5 Faculty Participation in the Selection of Certain Members of the Central Administration);

WHEREAS the AAUP recommends that all faculty representatives be involved “…in all stages of the search process and by providing the entire faculty and other members of the campus community the opportunity to meet with search finalists in public on campus”;

WHEREAS the principal of the search firm hired by the GMU Board of Visitors, Jan Greenwood, recently acknowledged that search firms “themselves benefit from a search being open” because open searches allow for public scrutiny and protect against “a bad hire”;

BE IT RESOLVED that the AAUP chapter of George Mason University calls on Rector Tom Davis and all members of the Board of Visitors to uphold the GMU Faculty Handbook and create public opportunities for faculty, staff, students, and the community-at-large to meet with and vet all finalists for the presidency; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the AAUP chapter of George Mason University ask the George Mason University Faculty Senate to join us in calling for public forums to meet with all finalists for the presidency.