GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Thursday, February 18, 2016
Johnson Center Meeting Room F (336) 2:30 – 4:00 p.m.

Present: Charlene Douglas, Mark Houck, Timothy Leslie, Keith Renshaw, Joe Scimecca, Suzanne Slayden, Susan Trencher, S. David Wu, Eve Dauer (University Registrar), Dr. Thulasi Kumar (Associate Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment).

I. Approval of Minutes of January 21, 2016: The minutes were approved.

II. Announcements
Provost Wu introduced Dr. Thulasi Kumar as the new Associate Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment. He comes to us from the University of Connecticut and has years of experience in this field.

We are in the process of planning university-wide faculty recognition events, likely in early fall, to recognize all award winners from various sources. “Faculty Achievement Committee” trying to figure out how to do this.

FERPA and the release of student information – Chair Douglas welcomed Eve Dauer, University Registrar. As she distributed a handout about FERPA, Eve noted she did not change any type of policy regarding what constitutes Directory Information, but would like to see some of it changed. Karen Gentemann and Kris Smith set up a committee, invited Eve Dauer to join, on what could be released and what could not be released; awaiting arrival of Dr. Kumar to join us. We found that information has been given out liberally, such as class standing. Risks include faculty members who put exams outside classroom – self-service where you could see everyone’s grade; individuals could look up grades of a neighbor’s child. Records containing personally identifiable information directly related to the student, such as social security number, race, ethnicity, citizenship status, gender, and grades can only be accessed by a school official with a legitimate educational interest. The individual must be acting within scope of employment and/or job task. So it depends on who you are, what rights you have. As an employee of Mason, you do not always have right to information. Academic Purpose: to release student names and contact information to a department for study abroad opportunities. Non-academic purpose: releasing names and contact information to a travel agency for a pleasure trip. Gray areas such as Sodexho conducting survey to ascertain what food choices they would like to have – not an educational purpose but good for quality of student life. To give to them for one-time purpose and must be destroyed – information FERPA would deem not harmful. We can be more restrictive than federal law, but not less restrictive.

Discussion: At FERPA training, a faculty member was stunned to hear that they would give this information out to anyone who asked. Eve responded: Not complete black and white – every situation is different. Suggestion made to reach out to student government and invite their input to the committee; student involvement on committee very important – their feelings, viewpoint may be very different. Eve is willing to do this and looks forward to receiving faculty input also. Faculty also have a real interest in this question; often we are asked by parents for information. Other concerns included releasing names/addresses/phone numbers of students as a gateway to obtaining other information. Private companies may wish to hire students. Such information to be released only if students give permission to
release it. Unless you disable it, students can contact all other students on Blackboard. The Faculty Senate would also like to elect a representative to serve on this committee.

Ad-Hoc Make Up Classes announcements: with many cancellations for weather this winter, the Registrar’s Office had to change deadline with more and more deadlines – Financial Aid and Student Accounts weighed in, if we did not stop deadline, could not disburse financial aid. Need to have a census date. Eve believes more involved than financial aid and will get back to us.

The Faculty Matters Committee distributed a handout draft for distribution to faculty “Suggestions for Ad Hoc Class Makeups” which contains links providing instructions about how to record classes, and other technological aids. Discussion: As a solution in real-time, possible implosion should everyone try to log in at the same time. Some faculty have both an online and in-class version of course(s): in event university is closed/delayed openings, can send an email to class announcing “Unit X” is now online. We have to do things differently, as we will continue to have this problem. Going forward into the 21st century, when you miss the class, record the class. Some classes are hard to pull off online, labs also. To include suggestions for alternate strategies, e.g., makeups as faculty responsibility. Keith Renshaw was commended for his work on this. There is a wide gamut of opinion, and asks for your edits; also provides a way for less experienced faculty looking for more experienced faculty to help/guide them.

President Cabrera will attend the March 2, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting.

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

A. Academic Policies – Suzanne Slayden: We have two issues:

1. Drop deadlines established by Faculty Senate – to the extent Faculty Senate thinks about it, if we miss a substantial number of classes, there needs to be a formal way to set deadlines back in unusual situations. The 67% date was the only date not changed as we missed half the classes before the deadline. Could not find anything in Federal Financial Aid book about this. other than changing status from full-time to part time status. Full-time status defined between 12-18 hours. In looking at Mason website, as long as remain full-time status, no consequences to financial aid, and also reviewed other universities' websites. As it severely impacts classes, requests change (push back) deadline.

2. Confidentiality of student comments in course evaluations. 1978 document states student comments are confidential. Now says they may be read. Provost Stearns had announced this change to the Faculty Senate but cannot find it in Faculty Senate minutes. Additional documentation distributed among the committee, also included recommendations to reaffirm the long standing agreement on confidentiality of student written responses on Course Evaluations.

Discussion included evaluations sent to department chairs before distribution to faculty; some chairs read them. Confidentiality needs to be worked out between faculty and administration; there need to be some constraints, not a unilateral overturning of previous policy. Sometimes comments may signal something is wrong; particularly in units with a large adjunct component. Some ask why do we need evaluations to begin with? Literature is shifting on this – sample problem = 20, but only 4 responses received. Often only comments received at both extremes.

Provost Wu: Like many of you, teaching evaluation commonplace; most people view as a constructive way to get feedback. When it comes to how comments are to be used: often included in tenure/promotion files, may include raw form in comments; unknown if faculty member included them voluntarily.
B. **Budget and Resources – Susan Trencher**  
We met with J.J. Davis for 90 minutes last Friday, got about halfway through university budget. We asked a lot of questions. We plan to set up meetings, a regular exchange, to ask what she wants to tell us, what we need to ask, then Budget and Resources will bring to the Executive Committee. Some Budget and Resource Committee members have budget experience themselves. Each committee member comes from a different college or school.

C. **Faculty Matters – Keith Renshaw and Joe Scimecca**  
We are working on trigger warnings statement; hope to have something for Executive Committee review later in March. See also earlier discussion on [Ad Hoc Class Make-Ups](#).

D. **Nominations**  
Timothy Sauer, Professor, Mathematical Science, is nominated to serve on the Recreational Advisory Committee.

**University Excellence Awards – June Tangney.**  
Kim Eby to ask June Tangney if willing to serve on this committee.

**Discussion:** Agreement there needs to be criteria in place for naming of University Professors, as well as mechanism, Provost's responsibility to make decision. Provost Wu responded there is a committee chaired by June Tangney, consisting of university professors who review all nominations and made recommendations to Provost Wu. Provost Wu follows their recommendations. Distinguished Service Professor awards do not specify tenure requirement. (See also [Faculty Handbook](#) p. 21 - **2.2.5 University Professor and 2.2.6 Distinguished Service Professor**).

E. **Organization and Operations - Mark Houck**  
We are still working on the Multilingual Task Force charge. We received an inquiry about history of raises associated with promotions – sent to Budget and Resources. The Salary Equity Study Committee may also be a resource for this information.

The Apportionment of Faculty Senate Seats for 2016-17 was distributed. Summary of Results: The College of Humanities and Social Sciences loses one Senator, moving from 15 to 14. The School of Business gains one Senator, moving from three to four. The allocation to all other collegiate units remains unchanged. See [Attachment D](#) for full text of the report.

**Discussion:** Concern expressed that INTO faculty are not represented in the Faculty Senate; they are in no-mans’ land. What academic unit are they appointed to? Provost Wu responded INTO faculty are in a Joint Venture – a 501D3 – an independent entity. He will also check to see if they are officially state employees. The Director of INTO does not report to Provost Wu, unlike the deans who report to him. See also Institutional Research and Reporting Faculty Data page at [https://irr2.gmu.edu/index.cfm?activePage=faculty&subLink=Faculty](https://irr2.gmu.edu/index.cfm?activePage=faculty&subLink=Faculty) for detailed information.
IV. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

V. New Business, Updates, and Discussion

Online Evaluation of Instruction: Cost Evaluations: Administrative Cost Report received from Kris Smith. See Attachment A. Executive Committee members commended Chair Douglas for obtaining this information. Discussion about smart devices included concerns about their availability to all students, concerns about privacy issues for typed comments. Dr. Kumar noted there are security provisions for software. Some faculty are concerned about hacking – it was also noted the current paper system includes asking students to drop off evaluations not secure. Can the evaluations be linked to IP addresses? The evaluations can be completed in classroom in 15 minutes with a 10-day deadline. Can remind those who have not completed evaluations; those students who have dropped out of course will not be included. Idea to complete on phone in class. Dr. Kumar added he has not seen bimodal thing - it usually takes 3-5 years to get close to paper response rate. The shift from paper to online evaluation is a cultural shift, but it will be achieved. Objections to global email including students who did not go to class (often/at all), how to deal with student absent on the one day evaluation distributed? Provost Wu asked Dr. Kumar if he has experience with this product. Dr. Kumar: It took us three years to transfer to online survey. Printing costs for 250,000 pieces of paper. Easier to get comments on line to review; will see more constructive comments typed on. Saves money, and for faculty members, you have access to more information and can analyze data on your own.

Executive Committee members also noted the format we are using now, when it was created, questions never validated. No idea if books helpful or not, etc. In a field trying to measure something and it measures this so poorly, at the end of the day, if we use an instrument, to make it an instrument that is validated. If it takes 3-4 years to get up to level, concerned assistant professor may be denied tenure because of this? Legal issues? Hopefully more included than that, not all departments include peer evaluations. May be on departments to push out a more holistic evaluation of teaching. Dr. Kumar: Faculty can implement different evaluation instruments to get specific information requested by the faculty. This kind of individual evaluation will not be viewed by the university. Provost Wu: The Effective Teaching Committee is charged to do this – (discussion of questions 15, 16 with no correlation).

Faculty Dining/Gathering Options were discussed. The Senate will not be involved in the establishment of the Faculty Club or any other faculty dining option. See Attachment B. Distribution of President/Provost Survey to Chairs of Senate Standing Committees and University Standing Committees. See Attachment C.

Senate Room 2016-17 – T. Leslie: Robinson set for renovation in medium term. Tim to look for a classroom with more space and similar structure.

VI. Agenda Items for March 2, 2016 FS Meeting

- Draft FS Minutes February 3, 2016
- President Cabrera
- Provost Wu
- Announcements
• Timothy Sauer, Professor, Mathematical Science, is nominated to serve on the Recreational Advisory Committee (Nominations Committee)
• Apportionment of Faculty Senate Seats for 2016-17 (Organization and Operations)

VII: **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Meg Caniano
Faculty Senate clerk
ATTACHMENT A

Course Evaluations
Administrative Cost Comparison

In 2007, the Office of Institutional Research and Reporting (IRR) introduced a web-based version of the course evaluation for use with online courses. It was also made available, as a pilot, for anyone who wished to use it instead of the paper version. Over the next two years, many faculty members, departments, and colleges/schools used the web-based version for their face-to-face (F2F) classes. While the results were not significantly different between the two modes of administration and the differences by faculty member and course between paper and web-based were no more than the differences by faculty member and course when Fall and Spring semesters were compared, there still were concerns. The response rates for the web-based version was considerably lower than the paper version (45% compared to 75%), and the results for the web-based version were more bi-modal than those from the paper administration. Therefore, in 2010, the adaption of the online version was set aside until a solution could be found to overcome the shortcomings. More specifically, the concerns were:

- Lack of comparable response rates,
- Differences in response distribution,
- Lack of ability to administer the survey during class, and
- the fact that students who did not attend class were able to evaluate the course.

Three years ago, IRR began to make preparations for the purchase of new equipment and software in anticipation of the loss of the service contracts on the two Scantron scanners currently used to process the paper course evaluations. These scanners are functional but once Mason is unable to renew the service contracts, the university loses both technical support and access to replacement equipment on a temporary basis until the issue can be resolved either through repairs or the purchase of new equipment. At the same time, the office sought a solution that would enable the university to offer a more robust web-based solution to address faculty concerns.

IRR felt that staying with Scantron but upgrading to its ClassClimate solution would enable the university to merge the administration of the paper and web-base surveys into a single process with little impact on faculty and students. Currently, the two processes are completely separate. The upgrade would require the purchase of the ClassClimate software, two-new scanners, and a server along with training and support. The initial cost would be approximately $100,000 with on-going costs similar to those under the current system. After receiving the financial support to move forward, an application was submitted to Information Technology’s Architecture Standards Committee (ASC) for review of the software and hardware requirements. ASC would not support the continuation of ITS server support for the new software/server configuration as submitted. It did indicate IT could support the solution if Scantron offered the system through a hosted option. Scantron was just getting ready to roll out this option but the cost became prohibitive for Mason, requiring an annual cost almost equal to what we were prepared to spend as a one-time purchase. Given that, IRR abandoned the Scantron solution and began looking at other solutions.
After reviewing several other products, IRR decided to suggest to the Provost and the Faculty Senate the adoption of IOTA Solutions due to the breadth and depth of features offered as well as its ease of use. Following the Faculty Senate directive in 2010, IRR brought the University Committee on Effective Teaching of the Faculty Senate in to the review process with a demonstration of the software. If the Committee did not see the product as a viable tool, there would be no reason to move forward. The Committee on Effective Teaching provided positive feedback about the product and its features, requested clarification on a few aspects of the product, discussed options to improve response rates, and more recently, expressed concerns about “the reliability of the wireless network on campus” and “the challenges in providing open-ended responses on a personal devise.”

Addressing previous and current concerns has been central to the adoption of any new product. IOTA Solutions allows for a great deal of customization and responds to most of the concerns expressed by the Faculty Senate and the Teaching Effectiveness Committee. It also has features sought by the Faculty Senate following the last review of the survey itself in 2009. These include:

- The survey is administered through an application on all smart devices allowing a faculty member to administer the survey during class.
- Response rates should be comparable to surveys administered by paper given that the surveys can be administered electronically during class.
- Response distributions would be more consistent with those of paper surveys given the increased response rates.
- All open-ended responses would be captured electronically so faculty would be able to retain electronic records of not only the reports that are published on the IRR website but of the open-ended responses as well. (Currently, the web-based version of the survey garners greater feedback on open-ended questions.)
- Real time course enrollment as reflected in Banner just prior to survey distribution would ensure only students currently enrolled would be offered the opportunity to complete the survey.
- Survey results would be available immediately after the Registrar’s final deadline for grade submission.
- This approach would reduce considerably the staff time and labor costs required to administer and process the surveys.
- Various question formats and response options are available.

Additionally, with the implementation of IOTA Solutions,

- Multiple surveys for the various teaching modalities such as seminar, lab, and lecture, could be developed.
- Item banks could be developed to offer more question options to meet faculty or unit preferences.
- Enhance analyses would be available.
- Faculty-developed questions would be easier to use as they would become part of the survey itself.

If the university decided to implement IOTA Solutions, the personnel costs would decline considerably. The handling of paper surveys is very labor intensive. With a survey application, processing time would be reduced and staff resources could be redirected to provide other IRR services such as greater analytic and enhanced business intelligence resources.
The next steps for informing the methods for administration would be to submit an ASC application for the IOTA Solutions software in order to ensure it meets all IT requirements. If ASC approval is received, the product would be demonstrated widely across campus and faculty and administrative feedback would be sought. This process would begin with the Faculty Senate, Provost, Deans and department chairs and then provide open demonstrations for all faculty. If viewed favorably, the Office would work with the Faculty Senate and its committees on developing a timeline for implementation, creating and implementing a marketing campaign (educating students and faculty), and actual roll out of the product.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Comparisons of Administrative Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms &amp; Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume License</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Assurance Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Hosting Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start up Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Scanners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software installation &amp; training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total One-time Start up Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The current system is not sustainable due to aging equipment and the anticipated discontinuance of the maintenance contract

**Scantron ClassClimate Personnel costs will depend upon the proportion of paper surveys to electronic surveys; for IOTA Solutions the personnel costs will decrease over the first few years and then stabilize. With the reduction of personnel costs, staff resources can be redirected to data analysis and the development of applications to enhance the university’s access to data.
Attachment B

Faculty Dining / Gathering Options

There are three (3) dining options on the table:
1. Bistro
2. Expanded / Improved Bistro {previous examples George’s and faculty area in SUB II}
3. Faculty Club

1. What is the feedback on The Bistro?
2. Would the preference be for a retail option (which one?) or a Sodexo dining option (mini-Southside).
3. What are your thoughts on the Faculty Club?

Faculty and Staff Lounge Opens in Johnson Center

(Mason News February 9, 2016)

Faculty and staff of George Mason University now have their very own place to shoot the breeze on campus.

The faculty and staff lounge opened Feb. 3 in a space once occupied by the Bistro on the ground floor of the Johnson Center. Auxiliary Enterprises and Human Resources and Payroll will host an official dedication of the space from noon to 1:30 p.m. on Feb. 12.

The lounge has no formal name, but that issue will be addressed by a university naming committee soon, said Marc Fournier, assistant vice president of Mason Business Services. The lounge is open from 7 a.m. to 3 p.m. Monday through Friday; there is no food service.

Human Resources staff hopes the lounge will be a place where employees can go to “change up their scenery,” bring lunch or have coffee, said Janet Walker, life/work connections manager for Human Resources and Payroll at Mason. “From a wellness perspective, it’s nice to have a place where they can relax and rejuvenate a little bit.”

Soft music will be played and a muted television will be set to a news channel with closed captioning.

Faculty and staff members had been requesting a space to congregate for coffee or lunch for some time, Fournier said. Several offices on campus came together to discuss using the space as a lounge.

“[Mason] Facilities Planning and Facilities Management worked collectively to make some quick improvements to the space by adding some soft seating that was repurposed from the Fenwick Library renovation,” Fournier said.

The lounge still serves as a programmable space for university events in the evenings; Mason Student Centers, Mason Dining and University Events will work together to coordinate lounge hours with any
events scheduled for the space, such as orientation or graduation activities. In those cases, Room 117 in the Johnson Center will be used as a backup.

Plans are in the works to make some light renovations to the space during the summer. These include separating the former kitchen area, adding needed storage space, bringing in some softer elements to the lounge/meeting area and incorporating a small retail establishment similar to Starbucks.

February 3, 2016

Professor Charlene Douglas, Chair
Faculty Senate
George Mason University

Dear Charlene:
Unfortunately, you received the GMU Faculty Club Proposal too late to place on the February agenda, however, we’re pleased that it will be presented at the March meeting. The proposal you have was written by a small committee of GMU faculty who’ve been concerned with what one faculty member termed “faculty alienation at GMU,” which has resulted in a noticeable absence of a “faculty community” on campus. The proposal therefore represents a small step towards addressing a problem which many view as both multi-faceted and multi-dimensional. The term “small step” is important here, because the proposal you have is merely a “work in progress,” and must be seen as the first step in the creation of a dialogue which will hopefully lead to the acceptance of the idea of the faculty club and to the machination necessary in making the idea a reality.

The creation of the GMU Faculty Club will not only create a sense of community among faculty and staff. It will also enhance the quality of life, and in doing so, increase the intellectual, social, and academic climate for students, for we believe that increased interaction which results in a greater sense and spirit of community will spill over into the classroom and help professors become better teachers and more involved in interdisciplinary teaching, research, and other service-connected activities.

As we begin to discuss the merits of a faculty club, we, and those who support the idea, will seek the advice and counsel of every segment of the university community. We will be very attentive to the suggestions, ideas, and recommendations from faculty and staff. This listening process will continue as we seek to enroll Charter Members, select a Board of Directors, and solicit regular members. We believe this is a very important idea, and if accepted and if it becomes a reality, GMU and its faculty, staff, and students, will be the winners.

Sincerely,

Rutledge M. Dennis          Steve Pearlstein          Joseph Scimecca
A Proposal for a
George Mason Faculty Club

Faculty members at many colleges and universities have created faculty clubs to provide faculty, administrators and staff with a place to meet and get to know each other over coffee, lunch or an afternoon drink. At Mason, many of us have wondered why we didn’t have such a place. As the university has grown in size and stature, and as the faculty has become more diverse, the need for such a common “watering hole” has become apparent. And given the current emphasis on interdisciplinary teaching and research, there is now an even greater need for a place where professors from different departments and disciplines can get to know each other and exchange ideas.

A faculty club on the Fairfax campus would provide opportunities to break down the intellectual and social walls that now separate various schools and departments. It would provide a space for the kind of informal social interaction and intellectual discourse that inevitably lead to greater cooperation, innovation and inspiration. It would create a greater sense of collegiality and common purpose among the faculty and between faculty and administration. For many of us, it would enhance our work and campus life by making both more stimulating and satisfying.

Neither the old ”George’s” in the Johnson Center nor the bar and restaurant at the Mason Inn was successful in satisfying this need for a convenient and intellectually nourishing meeting place. With the support of the university and a sufficient number of our colleagues, we propose to try again, this time with an independent faculty club run by and for its members—a place we can truly call our own.

Structure and Membership

We propose to establish a non-profit association or corporation to be called the George Mason Faculty Club, a membership organization that would be open to all faculty members, full-time, part-time, adjunct and retired. Membership would also be offered to current and retired administrators and past and present members of the Board of Visitors.
Governance

The Club would be governed by a Board of Directors elected by the members. The Board would be authorized to maintain its own accounts and have the authority to enter into contracts and hire auxiliary personnel to perform services under the direction of a club manager, to be chosen jointly by the Board and the food service provider.

Membership Fees

The Club would charge a membership fee of $25 per semester. It would also offer charter membership to faculty members, administrators and to the University on behalf of its senior administrators, for $250. Charter members would be exempt from regular membership fees. All membership fees would be deposited into a Reserve Account, and be used to cover unanticipated operating losses and pay for capital expenditures. Membership fees would be waived for professors and administrators in their first year at the University, and for retired professors and administrators.

Space and Place

The Club would lease the necessary space, kitchen equipment, bar and dining room furniture from the University for a dining area, bar and lounge at a guaranteed annual rental rate sufficient to compensate the University for its incremental out-of-pocket costs associated with providing such space and equipment. The Club would also make annual contingent lease payments equal to a negotiated percentage of any operating profit the Club might realize. In negotiating a contract, our aim would be to insure that the university will not “subsidize” the Club and that the Club will not be a source of “profit” for the University.

The University would reserve the right to use the space when it is not in use by the Club, at nights, on weekends, during the summer and during semester breaks.

After discussion with University officials, we recommend the Club occupy the location on the third floor of the Johnson Center once occupied by George’s. This would include the kitchen, the open dining area and the space currently used as a Faculty Lounge.
Operating Hours

The Club would be open Monday through Thursday during the fall and spring semesters, offering continental breakfast, lunch and late afternoon bar service. Limited service might also be available on Fridays. The Club lounge would offer complimentary morning and afternoon coffee and tea to all faculty and administrators, members and non-members, with voluntary contributions requested of non-members.

Food and Beverage Service

The Club would contract with an outside vendor to provide the food and beverage service. After conversations with officials from the university and Sodexo, we anticipate that the contract would be with Sodexo under terms of the master contract already in place with the University. We anticipate that as part of the contractual agreement, Sodexo would assign one of its chefs to work directly with the Club’s Board of Directors and serve as full-time chef-manager of the food and beverage operation.

For a Club to be financially viable, we believe there would need to be 400 active members who, on average, eat one lunch a week at the Club during the fall and spring semesters, plus the occasional breakfast and late-afternoon drink at the bar. Our initial pro forma assumes that continental breakfast would cost $7 and the cost of lunch would range from $10 to $15, excluding wine and beer. For billing purposes, members may be required to keep a credit card on file with the club for payment of charges. There would be no tipping or cash transactions. To assure financial viability, the Board may decide it is necessary to require members to spend a minimum on food and beverage each semester.

Members would be allowed to bring guests to the club for meals or drinks, but no one guest will more than three times per semester.

The Club would be authorized to provide breakfast, lunch or cocktail service to groups of up to 25 people at the request of any member, who shall be present and responsible for payment. Such special events shall not be allowed to disrupt the regular food and beverage service.
The Club would be responsible for any operating losses from the food and beverage service, with any losses covered by Reserve Account.

Rutledge Dennis  Steven Pearlstein  Joseph Scimecca
Attachment C

To: Committee Chair
Name of Committee

Subject: Annual Faculty Senate Evaluation of the President/Provost

As you may be aware, at the Faculty Senate meeting on January 21, 2009 a motion was approved to “conduct an annual evaluation of how effectively the President and Provost have interacted with the Faculty Senate during the preceding academic year.” The evaluation will include input from the chairs of the Senate Standing Committees, as well as from ad hoc and University Committees that report to the Senate. (For more information, see http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/MINUTES_FS_2008-09/FS_MINUTES_1-21-09.htm.) A resolution approved at the Faculty Senate Meeting April 6, 2011 amended and elaborated the distribution of the evaluation to the Board of Visitors and the General Faculty.

This message requests information from you as Chair of your Committee. Although we would prefer to receive signed reports with some degree of specificity in the response, we also respect a desire for confidentiality: If you would prefer, you can discuss these matters in a general manner (so as not to reveal the identity of your Committee) and submit an anonymous report. Or you may contact a member of the Executive Committee and speak confidentially.

This report must be presented to the Senate at its April meeting (April 6, 2016). Time is of the essence, so we ask that you respond to the following questions by sending an e-mail to facsen@gmu.edu at your earliest convenience -- and no later than Monday, March 28, 2016.

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?

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?

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.

4. Please relate any additional information you may have regarding interactions between your Committee and the President or Provost or their staff.

Thank you for your help in conducting this evaluation.
Charlene Douglas, Chair
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Attachment D

Apportionment of Faculty Senate Seats for 2016-17
Report from the Operations and Organization Committee
February 18, 2016

The process for determining the apportionment of Senators among the various academic units for the next academic year is stipulated in the Charter and is unchanged from last year. Here is a summary of the process and findings:

**Process:** The Senate Charter, in Section 1.B., provides the rules for apportioning Senators among the academic units. The Committee on Operations and Organization is charged with performing the calculations and determining the allocation of Senate seats.

**Data:** As in previous years, these results are based on Instructional Faculty FTE data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Reporting. The Senate Charter reads: “The number of Senators representing each collegiate unit (College, Independent Unit or Unit Pool) shall be determined according to the principle of proportionality, based on the full-time equivalent size of the Instructional Faculty of each Collegiate Unit or Institute Pool on February 1st of each year….” The data used in the calculations are the official census data as of Fall 2015. These are the latest official Instructional Faculty FTE data that were available on February 1, 2016. They are available at: https://irr2.gmu.edu/index.cfm?activePage=faculty&subLink=Faculty (accessed 2016-02-18).

**Summary of Results:** The details of the calculations are provided on the next page. Here is a summary of the results:

- The College of Humanities and Social Sciences loses one Senator, moving from 15 to 14.
- The School of Business gains one Senator, moving from three to four.
- The allocation Senators to all other collegiate units remains unchanged.
- As in the previous year, SCAR and Krasnow individually do not meet the threshold requirement as defined in Section I.B.1. of the Charter for their own Senator. Thus, they are pooled into a single collegiate unit for the purposes of allocating Senate seats. The result is that SCAR and Krasnow together are represented by one Senator.
## Apportionment of Senators for 2016 - 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Fraction of total Instructional FTE</th>
<th>x50</th>
<th>2015-16 Allocation</th>
<th>2016-17 Allocation</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Education and Human Development</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>5.639</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>4.078</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>14.431</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>7.163</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krasnow Institute</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>3.505</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.485</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Policy, Government and International Affairs</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>2.723</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volgenau School of Engineering</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>6.447</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Unit Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.000</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>