
Senators absent: Ali Andalibi, Ann Ardis, Kenneth Ball, Sonia Ben-Ouagham-Gormley, Henry Butler, Carol Cleaveland, Lloyd Cohen, Rick Davis, Mark Ginsberg, Anne Holton, Aditya Johri, Brett Josephson, Germaine Louis, Alpaslan Özerdem, Maury Peiperl, Karen Reedy, Mark Rozell, Donglian Sun, Rebecca Sutter, S. David Wu, Andy Yao, Masoud Yasai.

Visitors present: Jeannie Brown Leonard, Dean, Student Academic Affairs, Kim Eby, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Development; Harold Geller, Associate Professor and Director of Observatory, College of Science; Stephanie Grimm, Art and Art History Librarian, University Libraries; Josh Kinchen, Associate Director, LGBTQ+ Resources; Doug McKenna, University Registrar; Janette Muir, Associate Provost, Academic Initiatives and Services; Joseph Pagan, Student Government liaison to the Faculty Senate; Shelley Reid, Director for Teaching Excellence, Stearns Center for Teaching and Learning; Dr, Matthew Smith, Director of Accreditation, Provost Office; Bethany Usher, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education; Tom Wood, Assoc. Professor, School of Integrative Studies/Chair, Effective Teaching Committee.

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

II. Approval of the Minutes of November 6, 2019: The minutes were approved.

III. Unfinished Business
Report from Faculty Senator Working Group re: Presidential Search

Senator Solon Simmons offered introductory remarks about the forming of the working group to come to some agreement with the BOV to allow faculty to have an opportunity to meet with the finalists in the Presidential Search. Interim President Anne Holton had noted that the BOV is moving in good faith. To her knowledge, it is for the first time in Virginia that there has been a faculty co-chair of the Presidential Search Committee. Faculty want to help the Board to respect the spirit of the Faculty Handbook. Violation of the Faculty Handbook would damage the relationship. These two irreconcilable positions: confidentiality of search claim by BOV against explicit Faculty Handbook language of transparent faculty involvement.

FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCESS WORKING GROUP PROPOSAL
On November 6, the Faculty Senate passed a motion to create a working group (Bethany Letiecq, Keith Renshaw, Solon Simmons) to “develop a set of possible methods to ensure that faculty have an opportunity to meet with each finalist in the Presidential Search.”

The Working Group conducted an open-ended survey and consulted with additional faculty colleagues regarding possible methods for meeting the language of the handbook. After engaging in extensive review discussion of several parameters, the working group now moves that the Faculty Senate:

1. **Rank order (by ballot) the options for each of three domains related to the search process.** There are 3 options for two of the domains, and 2 options for the final domain. Options will be ranked in order of preference, with the option of ranking one or more as “unacceptable.” Any option that receives a majority of “unacceptable” votes would **not** be included in the statement.

   The domains and accompanying options are:
   a. **Domain 1: Open/Confidential meeting**
      i. Finalists meet with faculty in a completely open meeting
      ii. Faculty who participate in the meeting sign a ‘code of ethics’ similar to that used by the search committee, which includes a statement about respecting confidentiality of finalists.
      iii. Live meeting is held in some way that hides the identity of the finalist (e.g., in the style of a “chat room”)
   b. **Domain 2: Meeting Participants**
      i. Meeting is open to all general faculty (with option to participate remotely)
      ii. Meeting is open to a set number of general faculty on a “first-come, first-serve” basis, with no option to participate remotely
      iii. Meeting is open to Faculty Senators only (in line with Section 1.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook that states, “The General Faculty delegates by Charter to the Faculty Senate the responsibility for shared academic governance at the university level.”)
   c. **Domain 3: Style of “Q&A” session**
      i. Open Q&A session after the presentation, where any faculty can ask questions on a “first-come, first-serve” basis
      ii. Engage in a “question development” process, whereby a set of questions is selected and then asked by faculty representative(s) on the Search Committee (or another appropriate faculty representative)

The motion was moved and seconded.

Discussion:
Several questions involved clarifications such as the removal of an option the majority voted as unacceptable; the logistics of implementing a meeting of the General Faculty; and thanks to the working group for all they have done.

The motion in favor of ranking the ballots was approved. The Sergeants-at-Arms will tabulate the ballots; results will be reported back for complete transparency before voting on the second motion.

Does this make the vote we had at the last meeting null and void? The wording of the motion called for this event. The wording of the second motion passed November 6th is reiterated in motion #2

2. **Vote to endorse the following statement entitled (“Faculty Senate Statement on the Presidential Search Process”), which would incorporate the final rankings of options listed above.**

The motion was made and seconded. The results of the rank order will be listed here.
Faculty Senate Statement on the Presidential Search Process

With regard to the process of a search for a University president, the Faculty Handbook (Section 1.2.5) states, “The search and selection process must include opportunities for the General Faculty to meet with candidates who are finalists for the presidency.”

On November 6, the Faculty Senate passed a motion that calls for “…a public forum for each finalist where s/he is invited to give a presentation to include the General Faculty, as well as students and staff, followed by a question and answer period;” for “faculty, students and staff [to] be invited to submit feedback regarding each finalist to the search committee”; and for “this phase of the search … [to] be of adequate duration to allow for the search committee’s consideration of such feedback.”

In line with the Faculty Handbook and with this motion, the Faculty Senate views the following as viable methods for meaningfully engaging faculty input in the search process:

1. Multiple finalists should engage in the process of meeting with faculty.
2. Each finalist should have a live (synchronous) meeting with the faculty – this meeting can be held in person and/or remotely.
3. All faculty who participate in a meeting with a finalist should be given an opportunity to provide feedback to the search committee, which the search committee would then incorporate into their final report and recommendations to the BOV.
4. The meeting would be held in one of the following formats, listed in order of preference:
   a. [Top-ranked “Open/Confidential” option listed here]
   b. [Second-ranked “Open/Confidential” option – if viewed as acceptable – listed here]
   c. [Third-ranked “Open/Confidential” option – if viewed as acceptable – listed here]
5. The meeting would be open to one of the following groups of faculty, listed in order of preference:
   a. [Top-ranked “Meeting Participants” option listed here]
   b. [Second-ranked “Meeting Participants” option – if viewed as acceptable – listed here]
   c. [Third-ranked “Meeting Participants” option – if viewed as acceptable – listed here]
6. The meeting will include a presentation to the faculty, followed by a Q&A session that is run in one of the following ways, listed in order of preference:
   a. [Top-ranked “Q&A Style” option listed here]
   b. [Second-ranked “Q&A Style” option – if viewed as acceptable – listed here]

Discussion:
To use plurality instead of majority? We cannot go back.

A Senator sees this as a non-starter: the BOV will not agree to this.

Confidentiality is not the same as secret. A Senator wants to have a discussion about what confidentiality means – would it mean that they will not be able to have a public meeting?

Chair Shannon Davis noted the Presidential Search Committee is currently in Evaluation Stage, no date for bringing candidates in. Another Senator observed nothing in the Presidential Search Website about bringing in faculty involvement. Senators do not see how the process could proceed without meeting per the Faculty Handbook:

“Section 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.*

*Students have also suggested they come forward to meet candidates.

Senator Keith Renshaw:  The motion on the floor involves motion passed originally, goes beyond Faculty Handbook language as the Faculty Handbook does not specify students, staff, or open forum; agrees with spirit. We’ve tried to come up with language to consider this. This provides options for the BOV meeting in December, Chair Shannon Davis will be there.

We could stick with motion passed last time, makes a point. Senator Renshaw wants to go forward and make a difference, maybe there is a compromise.

Senator: Shared governance means shared, not dictated to. Stick to our principles, compromise is not resolution. A straight principle of shared governance, either support the Faculty Handbook or not support it. If BOV is going to be adamant, we should draw the line – motion passed last week drew the line.

Senator: Expresed our preference to stick to previous motion or to compromise? Having said support open meeting, majority has spoken, what is debate above?

Motion to close debate was approved. To recommend a ballot vote on Motion #2 with the advisory: A Yes vote is to pass the motion with rankings. A no vote is not to pass this motion. The Sergeants-at-Arms distributed ballots. The motion was approved, 22 votes in favor, 18 opposed.

Voting results: The Faculty Senate Statement on Presidential Search Process was distributed Thursday, December 5, 2019 and results posted on the Faculty Senate website.

IV. Committee Reports
A. Senate Standing Committees
Executive Committee – no report at this time.

Academic Policies – Suzanne Slayden, Chair

Academic Policies Committee
Agenda Item for Faculty Senate Meeting, Nov. 6, 2019

Background: In Fall 2018, the Drop Deadline was temporarily changed from the end of the 5th week of course meetings to the end of the 3rd week, with an Unrestricted Withdrawal period during weeks 4-5. During the Unrestricted Withdrawal period, students may withdraw from courses without permission or limit (excepting where there might be financial aid or program requirements for enrollment). The Selective Withdrawal period was unchanged for weeks 6-9 and is limited to 3 such withdrawals for undergraduate degree-seeking and non-degree students.

Since then, the Academic Policies Committee has discussed the change with the administration and received data on student drop and withdrawal activity. The Committee has also solicited comment from students, faculty, and administrators. There have been few to no negative comments regarding the changes. Data are shown in the chart below.
Motion: The Academic Policies Committee recommends that for a 15 week semester, the deadline to drop a course is at the end of 3 weeks of course meetings and the deadline for Unrestricted Withdrawal is at the end of 5 weeks of course meetings. The deadlines for drop and withdrawal for courses of different duration will be proportional to those for the 15-week semester.

The motion was approved.

Budget and Resources – Timothy Leslie, Chair
We received the resolution as a referral in support of opportunities for students here on DACA and Temporary Protected Status. The resolution has unanimous support from the committee.

George Mason University Faculty Senate
Resolution in Support of In-State Tuition for All Virginians
November 25, 2019

WHEREAS, The availability of in-state tuition for all Virginia residents attending public colleges and universities provides “a pathway to better jobs and opportunities that benefit students and the state”\(^1\) as a whole; and

WHEREAS, During the 2015 legislative session, Virginia’s General Assembly “recognized the importance of providing access to college for all Virginians”\(^2\) and rejected a proposal that would have taken away access to in-state tuition for those with Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals status; and

WHEREAS, Current uncertainty about the future of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and Temporary Protected Status (TPS) programs creates the risk that Virginia students who are currently enrolled in Virginia colleges and universities could lose DACA or TPS status. These students could also lose access to in-state tuition\(^3\). Unless state policies change, the termination of DACA and TPS would result in students who currently receive in-state tuition being shifted to out-of-state tuition rates that they would have little hope of affording; and

WHEREAS, Virginia policymakers could mitigate the potential impact of this loss on DACA- and TPS-approved students and their families by expanding in-state tuition access to all Virginia residents regardless of immigration status. “Doing so would also provide more affordable access to Virginia colleges and universities for Virginia residents whose immigration status does not otherwise fall into the categories currently required for in-state tuition. At least eighteen states, including Colorado, Oklahoma, and Texas, have made this choice in order to boost the educational attainment of their workforces and help all families in their states succeed\(^4\); and

WHEREAS, Analyses of prior bills submitted to the general assembly have reported no negative fiscal implications for the Commonwealth; and

WHEREAS, George Mason University’s mission is to be an “inclusive academic community committed to creating a more just, free, and prosperous world”\(^5\);

BE IT RESOLVED, The Faculty Senate of George Mason University supports legislative action in Virginia to provide in-state tuition to all Virginians regardless of their immigration status.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, The Faculty Senate of George Mason University will share this resolution with the Faculty Senate of Virginia and the VA Conference of the AAUP and urge inclusion of in-state tuition for all Virginians as a topic of advocacy for Virginia Higher Education Advocacy Day.

Discussion:
Are other institutions of higher education in Virginia taking this action?
Senator Bethany Letiecq noted other colleges are considering this. The Virginia Conference of the AAUP has already endorsed this.
Another Senator observed the Attorney General’s guidance on this issue: court overruled this substantially. He does not see any reference to this in the resolution.
Senator Letiecq: You are not mistaken, currently DACA students have in-state tuition. If by executive order this is withdrawn, DACA would no longer be eligible. Resolution states “all Virginians,” not conditioned on citizenship status.
Residents of Virginia who moved here and did not obtain in-state tuition status since – once out-of-state student, to remain so?

\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Ibid.
\(^4\) Ibid
\(^5\) [https://catalog.gmu.edu/about-mason/university/](https://catalog.gmu.edu/about-mason/university/)
Senator Letiecq: Fiscal analysis in prior bills in Richmond found no fiscal cost to this. The resolution was approved.

Faculty Matters – Bethany Letiecq, Chair
The Faculty Evaluation of Administrators survey closed December 2nd, with the lowest response rate to date at 22%. We find this troubling, perhaps because no president to evaluate; perhaps because the survey was sent from a new office (OIEP)? We wish to relaunch the survey under my email and ask people to respond with new deadline date of December 20th.
Discussion: A Senator suggested the survey be distributed from the Faculty Senate email instead. It was also noted the survey would not be distributed to faculty who already responded. A motion was made and seconded to extend the deadline of the Faculty Evaluation of Administrators survey to December 20, 2019, and to send it out by Faculty Senate (facsen) email. The motion was approved.

Free Speech at Mason Policy: To understand how the policy was launched without Faculty Senate input, the committee will report back.

Nominations – Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Chair
Senator Broeckelman-Post thanked Senators for participating in an election by email.

Organization and Operations – Lisa Billingham, Chair
We are doing a great deal of research to report to the Senate and VP Lester Arnold.

B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

Effective Teaching Committee – Tom Wood, Chair
Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Pilot update
As included in the previous Faculty Senate meeting agenda (pp. 6-8), we have selected about 350 courses with OIEP to be piloted in the spring, encourage ongoing selection with Friday December 13th opt-out date, with very good support from the Provost Office. Please contact me (twood@gmu.edu) or Esperanza Roman-Mendoza (eromanme@gmu.edu) with any questions.

V. New Business

Chosen Name and Pronouns Policy - Jeannie Brown Leonard and Josh Kinchen Attachment A
We want to make you aware of the policy and how to make it inclusive; Doug McKenna will be co-chair in January, Jeannie will leave GMU in January to a new position in January. A wonderful collection of voices, a phased in process in terms of technology systems. What are your thoughts and concerns?
Is chosen names using first name and not last name? Correct.
What about name changes in marriage?
One of the challenges of technology is not enough space for both first and second names in Banner 9 technology. Legal name changes can be accomplished easily for 1st and 2nd last name. Mason ID cards are voter ID cards for students. A public health challenge re swiping cards, ID cards losing primacy, to move to iris and other identification cards, Cost to buy machinery prohibitive, backed off this, more important to have on class roster.

Matt Smith: Email address will not change, negotiations with Microsoft – identity management process to be a couple of years down the road, but not there yet.
When students ask for recommendations for jobs etc., more difficulty to identify if they change their name. To work on processes, to ask what name they wish to be used on “to add “we, ours, us”. We could expand it, not as common to look into use in the future. There is a place on the website requesting feedback.

How many do you think will take advantage of this?
Josh Kinchen: There are dozens, hundreds done via student applications and Human Resources.
Jeannie Brown Leonard: We can estimate, but do not actually know. I am “Bonnie Jean” some folks use middle names, not first names. International students choose to westernize first name, congruence also for transgender students, as a safety concern. She estimates 40% of population.
A Senator commended putting this forward. When you affirm someone’s gender identification, can be life-affirming. There are high rates of suicide to focus on people whose lives hang in the balance.
Josh Kinchen: Research on chosen name in youth, suicide rates went down when supported in school and workplace.
Do you have a communication plan to inform undergraduate students how to implement this?
Jeannie Brown Leonard: We are working on it, the process of making updates not fully implemented. Emails will be sent to students and employees in the next few weeks – and we are available to meet with department support representatives. We looked at best practices at all 25 Virginia institutions. We invite more faculty participation, to develop it collaboratively.
Chosen names appear on rosters.
Registrar can – Yes
Question when a student asks for a reference, can you request G# by email?
Matt Smith: G# not as risky as SSN, does not know for sure.
DG: IRR does not want to ask for G#.
Doug McKenna has gone through change from email; (1) not all needs to be directory information, discourages email use. (2) is part of student record and under FERPA, he has to look up any ID#. Students can declassify any part of student record themselves. But if something else, you could ask student if they were in class x or class y, or something else that you and the student would know, as an identifier for you.
Mark Smith will get input from Counsel on this.
Jeannie Brown Leonard: We will be sensitive to this.
Chair Davis “Jeannie Brown Leonard, we will miss you!”

Faculty Activity and Collaboration Tools (FACTS) – Kim Eby
Kim distributed “Mason FACTs “Faculty Activity and Collaboration Tools” (Attachment B). Faculty should have received emails also. She also noted the Senate’s Faculty Matters and Executive Committees provided input. The Mason Facts website https://provost.gmu.edu/faculty-matters/mason-facts-faculty-activity-and-collaboration-tools
contains a video presentation and a slide presentation with the piloting timeline on different tools over the next few years. Lots of faculty are working on leadership teams, meeting weekly.

Chair Shannon Davis was sorry Provost Wu was not here.

VI. Announcements
Save the Date! General Faculty Meeting: January 29, 2020, 3-4:30p, JC Cinema
Matt Smith is soliciting topics for QEP proposals – due December 19th.

VII. **Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty**

Chair Shannon Davis thanked everyone for all you do, for your service to this body and vigorous contributions ______

VIII. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kumar Mehta
Secretary
Policy 1143: Chosen Name and Pronouns Policy

Responsible Office: Registrar’s Office, Human Resources

Procedures: N/A

Related Law & Policy: N/A

I. Scope

This policy applies to all University students and employees.

II. Policy Statement

Students and employees may designate and use a Chosen Name and Pronouns for University purposes, except when use of a Legal Name is required by the University or by law.

Students and employees may designate a Chosen Name and Pronouns in University information systems only when such systems allow for such designation.

The University will ordinarily use a Chosen Name and Pronouns in university communications and reporting except when use of a Legal Name is required by the University or by law. By way of example but not limitation, Chosen Names will be reflected on class rosters, in Blackboard, in Patriot Web (including Degree Works), timesheets, and in directory listings including email address.

Legal Names shall be used for billing, verification of enrollment, payroll (W-2s), official transcripts, communication with external authorities, or as otherwise required by the University or by law. The University may identify students and employees by both Legal Name and Chosen Name at any time.

Students and employees may not use a Chosen Name for any kind of misrepresentation. Students and employees may not use profanity in a Chosen Name.

III. Definitions
Legal Name: means the first, middle, and last name of an individual that is recorded on the individual’s birth certificate, driver’s license, passport, or other legal documents.

Chosen Name: means a first name other than the legal first name by which the student or employee prefers to be identified, which has been designated by the student or employee in the Banner system.

Pronouns: means (for the purposes of this policy) he/him/his, she/her/hers, they/them/their.

IV. Compliance

Students and employees are expected to use a person’s Chosen Name and encouraged to use designated Pronouns.

V. Forms

Students and employees may designate a Chosen Name and Pronouns in Banner through the Patriot Web site.

VI. Dates:

A. Effective Date:

This policy will become effective upon the date of approval by the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance and the Provost and Executive Vice President.

B. Date of Most Recent Review:

September 15, 2019

VII. Timetable for Review

This policy, and any related procedures, shall be reviewed every three years or more frequently as needed.

VIII. Signatures

Approved:

_________________________________________________________  ________________________
Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance  Date

Approved:

_________________________________________________________  ________________________
Provost and Executive Vice President  Date
INVESTMENTS FOR FACULTY

MASON FACTs (FACULTY ACTIVITY & COLLABORATION TOOLS)

SUMMARY
As George Mason University matures as a multifaceted public research university, the need to invest in systems that facilitate the work of our faculty, programs, and institution as a whole becomes more critical. We must be able to promote faculty expertise and academic programs to prospective students, various university stakeholders, and the broader community. After an extensive inquiry and RFP process, the University has purchased two products from Interfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>PRODUCT FUNCTION</th>
<th>PRODUCT PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewal, Promotion &amp; Tenure (RPT)</td>
<td>Automates existing workflows for faculty renewal, promotion and tenure within a unified online content management system.</td>
<td>Streamlines the RPT experience for both candidates and reviewers at all levels within one secure and configurable system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-180</td>
<td>Collects, integrates, and consolidates data around faculty activities and accomplishments into a single database.</td>
<td>Facilitates efforts to leverage faculty strengths across the institution, support faculty collaborations and partnerships, and to tell the story of our faculty strengths to a variety of stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADVANTAGES

RENEWAL, PROMOTION & TENURE (RPT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASON</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Automates existing workflow processes for RPT within a unified online content management system</td>
<td>✓ Paperless, secure and unified platform</td>
<td>✓ Efficient and consistent processing of multiple dossiers through multiple stages of review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Promotes RPT Committee collaboration within one secure and configurable platform</td>
<td>✓ Automated submission of materials</td>
<td>✓ Status tracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Increases our ability to align and streamline our processes for both candidates and reviewers at all levels</td>
<td>✓ Configurable templates</td>
<td>✓ Controlled review access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY-180 (F-180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASON</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Collects, integrates, and consolidates data around faculty activities and accomplishments into a single faculty database</td>
<td>✓ Promotes scholarly networking and collaboration</td>
<td>✓ Promotes strategic and data-driven decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enhances our ability to: • Leverage faculty strengths across the institution</td>
<td>✓ Generates customizable CVs, biosketches, and other formats</td>
<td>✓ Integrates with faculty profiles on Mason website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitate faculty collaborations and partnerships</td>
<td>✓ Single-source, faculty-verified online academic portfolio</td>
<td>✓ Facilitates administrative reporting for compliance accreditation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tell the story of our faculty strengths to a variety of stakeholders</td>
<td>✓ Reduces the need to respond to multiple administrative requests</td>
<td>✓ Reduces workload in managing programmatic accreditation (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>