I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m.

II. Announcements
Chair Suzanne Slayden welcomed two new Senators: Doris Bitler (CHSS), and Claudio Cioffi-Revilla of the Krasnow Institute.

IV. New Business - Committee Reports
A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee - Suzanne Slayden, Chair

Mark Broderick, Vice President for University Development and Alumni Affairs, has provided an overview of a new University Policy 4008 Private Sector and Foundation Funding to George Mason University and the George Mason University Foundation, Inc. Now posted on the Faculty Senate website, it also contains answers to questions raised at recent Senate meetings.

The Executive Board of the BOV is working on a restructuring of its standing committees. (Five elected faculty representatives also serve on these committees, attending meetings and offering input.) The proposed restructuring may combine the present Finance and Resource Development Committee and Land Use and Physical Facilities Committee into a new committee. The Faculty and Academic Standards, University Life, and Equity and Diversity Committees may also be combined into a second new committee. Details are not yet finalized; we will inform you as we learn more. Current faculty representatives will be retained.

Academic Policies – Janette Muir, Chair
The AP Committee is in the process of evaluating course repeat policies. As you talk with your units, please inform us where issues occur.
**Budget & Resources** – no report.

**Faculty Matters – Larry Rockwood, Chair**
The Faculty Evaluation of Administrators survey will be distributed shortly. As two new members are nominated for election to the committee today, we will begin meeting in October. We plan to meet with Josh Cantor, Director of Parking and Transportation soon. Faculty are also reminded that Senator Peter Pober also serves as faculty representative to the Parking and Transportation committees.

**Nominations – James Bennett, Chair**
The following nominations are made to fill vacancies on committees:

Faculty Matters: Doris Bitler (CHSS) and Suzanne Scott (CHSS)
Athletic Council: Sheryl Beach (COS)

No further nominations were made from the floor. Nominations were closed and a unanimous ballot cast to elect nominees.

**Organization and Operations – Susan Trencher, Chair**
The committee will meet for the first time this week. Our agenda includes matters referred by Rick Davis, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Chair of the General Education Committee, as well as the Task Force on Satellite Operations.

**B. Other Committees**

**Faculty Handbook Revision Committee – Rick Coffinberger, Chair**
Two open forums were held on September 16th (Arlington) and September 17th (Fairfax), a third forum will take place October 1st at the Prince William Campus. A special meeting of the Faculty Senate will take place October 15th to consider the Handbook in its entirety.

**V. Other New Business**

**A. Motion** to approve the proposed University Policy on Ownership and Maintenance of Research Records
Chair Suzanne Slayden announced that Sheryl Beach, faculty representative to the Ownership and Research Records Committee received questions forwarded to her only last night. Therefore the Senate voted to defer consideration of the policy to our next (regular) meeting on October 22, 2008. See Appendix 1 for text of the motion.

**B. Introducing the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) – Kim Eby and Tom Owens**

Kim Eby, Associate Provost for Faculty Development, and Tom Owens of the Department of Music serve on the QEP Planning Committee and made a brief presentation:

As part of George Mason's SACS re-accreditation process we must create and implement a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). In this process we will need to demonstrate widespread campus involvement in and support for our QEP, as well as devote resources to ensure our plan's success. Thus, the QEP affords us the opportunity to identify a specific topic related to improving student learning for which there will be sustained institutional attention and support.

The QEP is a five-year intentionally developed plan for university improvement. The committee is now in the process of soliciting topics for study; topics suggested for study so far include:
Promoting Student Success through Critical Thinking
Enhancing the Undergraduate Experience through Research & Creativity,

The World as Text: Diverse Communities, Shared Understandings
Global Engagement at Mason

The QEP will be a major focus of the SACS visit in 2011. We will be further assessed in five years on how we are meeting our student learning outcomes. Committee members were appointed by the President and Provost, and they represent all academic units with undergraduate students, although such membership was not mandated. The Committee meets regularly and looks at SACS guidelines, GMU's mission statement goals, and assessment data to ascertain where we are and where we need to improve. We also have located a lot of research on effective teaching pedagogy. Participation and collaboration between faculty, students, and the community is stressed. Proposals should be submitted by October 24th. For guidelines and more information, please go to our website at http://qep.gmu.edu.

C. Budget procedures and issues - Provost Peter Stearns and Senior Vice President Morrie Scherrens

One of the challenges in working on a budget is that despite our best efforts, there is always a lack of clarity, especially when dealing with the unusual (state) budget situation in recent months. The GMU E&G Budget for FY 2008 had total E&G revenue of $335,065,000 of which tuition (NGF) comprised $175.5 million (52%), the General Fund comprised $140.3 million (42%), all other (NGF) $19.3 million (6%); excluding $20 million in private funds, and including $3.1 million ETF fund.

A graph of the General Fund Percentage of E&G from FY 91 to FY 09 resembles a roller coaster from a high point of 61.76% FY 91, sinking to 45.91% in FY 95; then rising again to 60.70% in FY01; and has fallen from 52.74% (original 2003), to revised (2003) figure of 49.17%. The downward slope continues to 39.70% in FY09. The state of Virginia funded 61% of costs in FY01; and now funds 39% of costs in FY09. We have never recovered from state funding cuts made during 2001-02. Tuition has risen as general fund revenue slumped.

Total E&G funds ($335,065,000) are used for Salaries and Wages 63% ($213.1 million); Fringe Benefits 17% ($56.2 million), and Non-Personnel 20% ($65.8 million). Many instructional faculty units do not have this 80/20 split between personnel and non-personnel costs. The split may be more like 90/10 or 95/5. Support areas may have 50/50 splits. Budget reductions will fall differently among units; there is no cookie cutter approach.

UNIVERSITY BUDGET SCHEDULE
FY09/FY10 BIENNIAL BUDGET PROCESS
FY09 BUDGET DEVELOPMENT
(E&G & AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES)

JUNE/JULY
- FY10 Budget Requests Highest Priorities from Units
- Review of FY10 Budget Requests by Budget & Planning Team
- Provost Meetings with Deans to Review Enrollment Plans/Priorities

SEPTEMBER
- FY10 Review of Budget Requests Continues (UBPT)
- FY09/FY10 Budget Reduction Plans Due to State

OCTOBER
- FY10 Preliminary Student Enrollment Increase Allocations for Academic and Non-Academic Units Including Preliminary Faculty and Staff FTE Additions
- FY10 Budget Request Submitted to State
FIVE YEAR BUDGET MODEL ASSUMPTIONS

ENROLLMENT GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Year FTE Enrollment</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-State Added FTEs</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Added FTEs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FTEs INCREASE</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL FTE

ENROLLMENT TARGET 23,350 23,600 23,950 24,400 24,900

Note: Budget model assumes moderate student enrollment growth of 1-2% per year.

GMU will aggressively seek to increase percentage of out-of-state and international students.

REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS: 2009-2013

- NO EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL FUND (GF) SUPPORT
- GF SUPPORT FOR 50% OF ANNUAL 2% SALARY INCREASE FOR FACULTY/STAFF
- GF SUPPORT FOR 0% OF OPERATING COSTS FOR NEW BUILDINGS
- ADDITIONAL $500K OF PRIVATE SUPPORT EACH YEAR FOR FINANCIAL AID
- INTEREST INCOME ($1.5 M) EARNED RETAINED BY MASON FOR MEETING MANAGEMENT STANDARDS
- GF SUPPORT FOR ENROLLMENT GROWTH (4% OF TOTAL COST)

The 2% annual salary increase is still planned pending changes from Richmond. Dr. Scherrens speculated that either the executive or legislative branch would defer salary increases to July 1st, as has occurred in the past.

When GMU receives state approval to (construct) new buildings, the State pays for only half the costs of maintenance and operations. Ten years ago the State paid 100% of costs; at its last legislative session, the State decided to pay 0%. Major new buildings that have been approved by the BOV are expected to receive funding as promised.

EXPENDITURE ASSUMPTIONS 2009-2013

- INFLATION FUNDING (LIBRARY, CONTRACTS, SPACE, UTILITIES, ETC.)
- ENROLLMENT GROWTH FUNDING ($3.5 – 4.0M ANNUALLY)
- OPERATING COSTS FOR NEW BUILDINGS
- FINANCIAL AID INCREASES
- UNIT PROGRAM FUNDING (INITIATIVES & BASE) ($2.0M ANNUALLY)
- SUPPLEMENTAL SALARY INCREASE FUNDING

**BUDGET OUTLOOK FY 2009/2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Reduction (FY 2008)</td>
<td>$7M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Reduction (FY 2009)</td>
<td>$7M</td>
<td>$14M</td>
<td>$21M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Reduction (FY 2010)</td>
<td>$7M</td>
<td>$14M</td>
<td>$21M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Guess (FY 2009)</td>
<td>$18M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Guess (FY 2010)</td>
<td>$18M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Tuition Increase (FY 2010)</td>
<td>8-10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GMU expects to hear from Richmond the actual percentage cuts by October 15th, once the State receives its first quarter revenue figures. GMU had to put together a 5% budget cut plan in August; which minimizes the impact on the University. Dr. Scherrens suggested that a statement from the Faculty Senate would also be very helpful. (A motion was later discussed; preference for general expression of concern emerged rather than citing specific amounts, etc.) At the 12-15% level, budget cuts will have impacts upon personnel to some extent.

**Question:** A Senator asked whether cuts made in FY 2009 and FY 2010 would be cumulative?
**Dr. Scherrens:** Yes.

**Question:** As retrenchment is the order of the day, why was a study commissioned to assess whether we need a medical school?
**Provost Stearns:** The commitment on the medical school study was made months before budget news. This is not to minimize the seriousness of the current situation, but it is important to make sensible decisions and not to divert the University’s momentum.

**Question:** Will the commitment to sustainability continue?
**Provost Stearns:** The Sustainability Committee will look at this. Sometimes it takes more time to realize the savings that come from introducing new sustainability measures. The University’s additional up-front expenditures cannot easily be introduced into the budget it must operate from.

**Question:** What about private sector funds? Are they sufficient to ameliorate the present crisis?
**Provost Stearns:** Private fund-raising is improving, but to expect it to step up to a level where it offsets current cutbacks is unrealistic. Given the present financial climate, it will now become harder to raise private funds also.

**Question:** Would slowing down building programs help us at all?
**Dr. Scherrens:** Most construction – 2/3 of E&G Buildings are already coming on line (Academic V, Academic VI, and Arlington II). Housing and the parking decks are user-financed construction.

**Question:** How does the budget situation at GMU in recent years compare to the experience of other universities in the state and region?
**Dr. Scherrens:** The same “roller-coaster” trend applies at other state of Virginia schools. Virginia historically has not put a lot of general fund support into higher education. I do not know about national level (trend).

**Comment:** A critical question is how much cost to pass on to students. It is perhaps unwise to increase tuition too much more.
Provost Stearns: A significant inquiry into tuition was conducted over the summer. We continue to be a little on the low side for in-state and out-of-state tuition among public institutions with whom we compete. A 10% increase in financial aid was dedicated in view of the projected tuition increase. Financial aid is more meager for graduate students. The Administration also plans to have an open session on the budget before plans become rigid.

The following motion was made and seconded:
“The Faculty Senate appreciates the consultative process regarding the budget the administration is engaged in.”
The motion passed.

VI. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty
Faculty are encouraged to participate in the Faculty Arts Board – we have a lot of fun, and a lot of wine!

VII: Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
David Kuebrich
Secretary
From: Barry W. Stevens  
Director, Research Policy Development  

Subject: University Policy on Ownership and Maintenance of Research Records

This memorandum transmits for your review a proposed new university policy on the ownership and maintenance of research records. By consensus, the committee that developed this policy endorses its contents and recommends that it be adopted by the university. The members of the policy development committee were the following:

Dan Polsby, Dean, School of Law,  
Peter Barcher, Associate Dean, College of Education and Human Development,  
Chris Hill, Professor, School of Public Policy,  
Sheryl Beach, Associate Professor, College of Science,  
Matt Kluger, Vice President for Research and Economic Development  
Jennifer Murphy, Director, Office of Technology Transfer, and  
Tom Moncure, University Counsel, who reviewed the policy for legal sufficiency.

I chaired the committee and served as facilitator, researcher, and drafter.

A policy on this topic is needed to protect the university’s interest in ensuring that records supporting the findings of its researchers are complete, responsibly maintained, and available for review in appropriate circumstances, to meet the obligations of sponsors, and to protect the intellectual property rights of both the university and inventors. And no concern is more central to members of the university community who engage in scholarly research than protecting the integrity of the research enterprise.

The proposed policy supplements the university’s policy on records management in addressing issues relating to the collection and maintenance of research records in particular. The principal features of the policy are the following:

a. The policy confirms that research records are the property of the university. “Research record” is defined to include only "the record, in any form or medium (including original research notebooks), of data, results, methods, or protocols, that –

   (1) Embody the facts resulting from scholarly inquiry or, in the case of research methods and protocols, describe how those facts were obtained, within the scope of an individual's employment or enrollment at the university; and

   (2) Are commonly accepted in the relevant research community as necessary to validate research findings.”

Records created by students are more strictly limited. Thus, much of the material produced in the course of scholarly inquiry is outside the scope of the policy and not subject to its terms.

b. It secures the researcher’s right, in most cases, to retain copies of records he or she creates and to use the records in subsequent research and in publicizing research findings.
c. It assigns the researcher the responsibility for the collection and maintenance of research records and charges department Chairs (or, in their absence, Deans and Institute Directors) with the responsibility for oversight of the practices of their faculty and students. Assistance regarding methods for maintaining records in hard copy and electronic form may be obtained from the University Records Manager.

d. It requires that research records remain under the control of either the researcher (or his or her Chair, Dean, or Director) or the University Records Manager except when the Vice President for Research authorizes an exception for good cause. When a researcher leaves the university, custody of original records may be transferred if the researcher and his or her Chair, Dean, or Director enter into an agreement that ensures the retention of the records for the period required for other Mason research records and appropriate access to those records.

e. It requires that, in most cases, records be retained for only the period required by regulations of The Library of Virginia adopted pursuant to the Virginia Public Records Act.

On behalf of the committee, I request that you approve this policy for transmittal to the Provost and the Senior Vice President for their approval.

The full text of the policy in pdf form: http://www.gmu.edu.facstaff/senate/research-records-policy.pdf and also linked to the Faculty Senate web page.