I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.

II. Approval of the Minutes of November 9, 2011: The minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Announcements
In the absence of Chair Pober, Chair pro Tem Suzanne Slayden opened the meeting and welcomed Dean Mark Ginsberg, College of Education and Human Development (see Attachment A). The CEHD faculty is distributed across all campuses of the university, with the largest number of faculty members just moved into Thompson Hall. In his second year as dean, one of Dean Ginsburg’s key objectives is to think critically about how programs interact for greater cohesion, greater sense of community, and scholarship among and between colleges. With implementation of the “New CEHD” divisional model (slide # 16), he stressed a strong commitment to shared governance.

Question: In your reorganization, are the divisions the same size?
Dean Ginsberg: They vary; the same number of academic programs, but programs differ in size.

Chair pro Tem Slayden then introduced Dean Andrea Bartoli, School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution. Dean Bartoli expressed his pleasure to be here as a dean. He celebrates the 30-year transition. His discussion emphasized gratitude and prudence. “Thirty years does not come lightly.” He emphasized that S-CAR is unique in the field, having undergraduate, certificate, graduate (masters and PhD) programs.

IV. New Business - Committee Reports

A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee – no report.

Academic Policies - Sheryl Beach
The committee met a week ago; nothing to report.

Budget & Resources – June Tangney, Chair
The committee continues to work on the summer salary issue. Members met with Provost’s staff. In September an announcement will be distributed to faculty to ask faculty to let their chair know by a certain date if interested in summer teaching. This will be transmitted to Deans and Directors who can then work with the Provost’s Office so that demands for summer teaching can be adequately addressed. It is worth noting that the percentage of courses taught by full-time faculty has increased over the past five years or so.

Faculty Matters – Jim Sanford, Chair
The Faculty Evaluation of Administrators results were distributed since the last meeting. The committee is working on maternal/paternal leave policy and will report on next semester.

Senator Mark Houck reported on the program allowing faculty to take courses as degree or non-degree students. He thanked Linda Harber for her assistance and noted there is a well-documented process for taking a non-degree class. Both degree and non-degree classes are free – with no admissions fee. There are good reasons to fill the forms out: to establish in-state tuition rates. The process is relatively straightforward and simple and seems to work.

Questions/Discussion:
A Senator inquired “Has any faculty member been denied admission?” Senator Houck responded that he had no idea. Another Senator reported when she wanted to take a course, was told you have to apply for admission, and during the application cycle for the university.

Senator Houck: If you take an individual class as non-degree, process, procedure is the same as for anyone else. Will ask for transcripts (you can send the most recent.) If you are seeking a degree, you must be in the admissions cycle. The rules are the same as for anyone applying for degree/non-degree status and it’s free.

Question: Was told that if you missed deadline for applications, you cannot take a course. So in order to sit in on an ongoing course, would have to apply during previous cycle?

Senator Houck: The same deadlines apply to you as to anyone else in Virginia.

Follow Up Question: Are faculty like any other member of Commonwealth? Not looking for special dispensation, just want faculty to know about taking courses.
Senator Houck: Not sure we should expect to be treated differently. Once you’ve applied for one class, you have to apply again.

Another Senator remarked “if you do this, you will be listed as a student and will be put on student mailing list.”

Senator Houck added one of his colleagues in Statistics has earned a degree in Music.

Nominations – Rick Coffinberger
Dimitrios Ioannou is nominated to fill the vacancy on the Academic Policies Committee for Spring, 2012 only. This will allow staggered membership of the committee. No further nominations were made from the floor. Nominations were closed and the nomination was approved.

One of our colleagues on the Organization and Operations Committee will go on leave for the spring term. If any Senator would like to volunteer to serve, please contact Suzanne Slayden or another member of the Nominations Committee.

Organization & Operations – Star Muir, Chair
The committee has been fact-finding about the EEO Statement currently under review by Corey Jackson and the Equity Office. There are two different versions, the most recent one includes non-discrimination on basis of “genetic information”, and how it was adopted.

We are also gathering information in response to a query about handguns on campus. Brian Walther referred us to Tom Moncure (University Counsel).

B. Other Committees

Academic Initiatives Committee Update on the Korea Initiative
Professor Bob Johnston, Chair of the Academic Initiatives Committee noted that they are still seeking some information, including financial information.

Responses to some questions were provided by Professor Min Park, and distributed to Faculty Senators to review. (See Attachment B).

Senator emerita Esther Elstun asked about the fact that the committee's attachment listed (in the first line) TWO proposed majors, and later, in the same attachment, THREE “initial majors.” Professor Johnston replied that two majors would be introduced at the outset, and a third would be introduced before the first five-year period ends.*

A Senator directed the following question to Anne Schiller, Vice President for Global Initiatives: “What is the impact of this delay on our program in Songdo? Why is the information not provided?”

Vice President Schiller: The information about operations after year five will come from the Songdo Managing Foundation. Dr. Cho, manager of the Foundation, was recently appointed by the mayor of Incheon and will convene the Foundation team. Similarly, other universities are also waiting for the same information. The Foundation is encouraging institutions to communicate with each other. Dr. Park, Director of Proposed Korea Campus Operations, has sent the Academic Initiatives Committee’s questions to Dr. Cho.

Follow Up Question: What is the impact of this delay? Urgency expressed at prior (Faculty Senate) meeting.
Vice President Schiller: Mason is not in a position yet to recruit in Korea. While we want to resolve the issues, it has been helpful, not a negative impact at the report.

A Senator noted “The BOV heard your report at its last meeting.”

Vice President Schiller: The BOV has similar questions. It allowed the University to make application for accreditation in Korea, but that does not commit the University to the project.

**Presidential Search Committee Update – Linda Monson and June Tangney:**

Senator Monson noted it was a privilege to be a faculty representative to this committee, emphasizing the respect for process. Other members on the committee include the Chair of the Staff senate, Chair of the Alumni Association, Linda Harber, and Tom Hennessey. She acknowledged questions about confidentiality and discussed “sensitivity” issues related to presidential searches.

Senator Tangney referred to feedback from BOV, community members, and faculty members who have listed attributes about preferred characteristics of an incoming President. Back and forth dealing with, very productive – what faculty are looking for in our next leader, to reassure us. Confidentiality was a major issue, she said, though some candidates will wait to apply to see if process will remain confidential, as some candidates are sitting presidents. The Search Committee and BOV, she said, have taken seriously the Faculty Senate desire to meet with BOV.

**DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL MEETING WITH CANDIDATES (quotes are incomplete):**

All elected Senators were asked to check emails after 5:00 p.m. Saturday in the event of a meeting between the elected Faculty Senators and finalists between 7:00 – 11:30 a.m. Sunday.

- **IF IT TAKES PLACE.**
- Undisclosed location at this time.
- Confidential: Who candidates are and location of meeting.
- Participation requires a confidentiality agreement to sign in. The elected Faculty Senators who wish to attend must sign it, and beyond search ending, cannot reveal who the other candidates are.
- Breakfast to be served, doors locked at 7:15 a.m. Meet and greet/questions and answers shortly after that
- **Q&A/Discussion** – all questions/comments from Senators

Question: Is this the only opportunity?

Senator Tangney: This is a fluid process. There are a number of presidential openings right now. Top candidates could consider other positions. After the meeting we will have an opportunity to discuss with faculty your views and will take them back to the BOV/Presidential Search Committee.

Follow Up Question: Only Faculty Senators?

Senator Tangney: Logistical constraints/time constraints/confidentiality issues with having four thousand people at an open meeting. It made sense to ask Faculty Senators as elected representatives of faculty as a whole to represent concerns of the faculty at large.
Comment: While he appreciates this as faculty representative/mechanism, it directly contravenes what the Faculty Handbook says – “meet with general faculty” – not secretive. BOV approved the Handbook but is not honoring its commitment. Feels a poor decision on part of BOV.

Senator Tangney: Understands sentiment. An open search would result in a restricted pool and would not get sitting presidents.

Senator Monson: Search Committee firm: This seems to be what the process is used at this point.

Senator Tangney: The vast majority of searches are closed. Open searches attract less experienced candidates.

Comment: I respect both of you enormously, but (this is) unacceptable. Noting the principle of faculty governance in the Faculty Handbook, the process is a clear violation of Faculty Handbook. Signing a confidentiality agreement as part of this would be complicit in violation of the Faculty Handbook.

Question: In Louisiana: Recent president search candidates are published. We passed a resolution; can you tell us about receipt of the resolution?

Senator Tangney: BOV received the resolution, (Referenced Student Government and Staff Senate also sent resolutions). They were “sympathetic.”

Comment: AAUP claims Faculty Handbooks have status of legal contracts and favors bringing top 3-4 choices to people willing to come to open meeting.

Senator Tangney noted the field of candidates would be of decreased quality.

Commenter: agrees.

Senator Tangney noted the Faculty Handbook encourages faculty members to be representatives of constituencies to participate in this process. Those faculties, she said, deserve to have a voice.

Comment: Flabbergasted by all this, as the idea of Faculty Senate is anchored in the Faculty Handbook. What’s the point of all this?

Senator Tangney: We were elected and are trying to reach out. We want you to meet and give feedback to BOV before they make decision. This is not ideal the circumstance/timing, but we must deal with reality of marketplace.

Comment: You were elected to represent our concerns. You are their spokespersons; you’ve gone over to the other side; you are not representing (our concerns)

Senator Tangney: We have represented your view that there should be an open forum; we have put this forward very strongly. It is not going to happen…. Over 150 nominees were carefully vetted, including both traditional and “out-of-the-box” candidates. Clearly the vast majority of people said they wanted an academic with vast experiences, scholar in his/her own right, and we have represented that.

Comment: Sympathetic to need for confidentiality and very troubled with disregard for Faculty Senate. Board should state how they plan to circumvent the role.

Question: Are elected members of Student Government and Staff Senates invited?

Response: No. There is not a comparable group of staff and students invited.
Question: This was an idea from the BOV? (Who originated idea?)

Senator Tangney: It was a suggestion the four faculty representatives put forward once made clear open forum would not happen...a compromise.

Comment: We can kick and scream, we ask for all we wanted, this is what we got – supports advocacy.

Comment/Question: How to report back to our constituents if we sign confidentiality agreement?

Senator Tangney: There will be people you will meet who will not be offered the job and have understanding (their) institution will not know about it.

Senator Monson: We have advocated for that.

Comment/Question: Won’t attend either, cannot sign agreement. Is there a plan to announce the plan at large to the university community?

Senator Tangney: Feels would be a mistake at this point as it’s a delicate point in process.

Comment: Despite talk of confidentiality/secrecy etc. things have a way of leaking out. Wouldn’t go because he wouldn’t want to be the big mouth who let it out. Things disturb me about the whole process.

Senator Tangney: To follow up: Is it the will of the Faculty Senate to have this opportunity or not to?

Motion: It was moved and seconded to assess the will of the Senate as to whether or not to attend the Sunday morning meeting to meet the Presidential Search finalists.

Comment: If we don’t hold the event, we get nothing else.

By a show of hands, the vote was 14 in favor of attending and 15 opposed.

Comment/Question: Difficult for me to decide/ My motivation would be personal curiosity than any functionality as representative of the faculty. What is it you are looking for?

Senator Tangney: We’re not going back to constituency to get feedback. Faculty/staff/students/alumni have already been surveyed for what people want in President, goals, etc. Feedback will be taken to the Board for the final decision.

[Meeting extended 5 minutes more.]

(Motion developed)

"The Faculty Senate endorses the opportunity for a closed forum with the candidates in the Presidential Search on Sunday morning," and the following amendment was made and approved: "with the full understanding that it is in direct violation of the Faculty Handbook."

Comment: To speak against motion: feels you were put in an untenable position, if we go to meeting to legitimize the process...

Voice Vote indicated a division of the house. By a show of hands, 17 votes in favor, 13 votes against, the motion was approved.

V. Other New Business – none
VI.  **Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty** – none

VII.  **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 4:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Earle Reybold
Secretary

*Text provided by Professor Elstun in response to inquiry.*
ATTACHMENT A

Please see Dean Mark Ginsberg’s presentation “The GMU College of Education and Human Development: Challenges and Opportunities”.

ATTACHMENT B

Academic Initiative Committee Update on the Korea Initiative

Faculty Senate Meeting of 7 Dec. 2011

This semester the Academic Initia-tives Committee has been working with Anne Schiller (Vice President and Associate Provost for Global Programs), Min Park (Faculty Advisor for the Songdo, Korea initiative), and Gil Brown (University Chief Budget Officer) to review the plans for a possible George Mason University degree program presence as part of the Songdo Global University. Each of these individuals has been helpful to the committee. At this point we still have some unresolved questions about this initiative. Until these questions are resolved, we are not able to offer an informed recommendation to the Faculty Senate about initiative.

For your information, attached is a listing of pending questions and as well as memo regarding future space costs and related issues at the Songdo campus. Once these questions and issues have been resolved, the committee plans to prepare a recommendation for the faculty senate.

30 November 2011

Attachments (2)

George Mason University Songdo Korea Campus Initiative

AIC Questions prepared by Professor Bob Johnston (November 29, 2011) with answers provided by Professor Min Park, Director of Proposed Korea Campus Operations (November 30, 2011)

1. Enrollment Targets: Initial first year target is 80 students in two majors (undergraduate degree programs)
   a. Who will be responsible for recruiting the students for this campus? Has she/he “bought into” the enrollment projections?
   The student recruitment plan and marketing plan (part of the documentation for accreditation application to Korea Ministry of Education) were developed by the Admission Office in cooperation with the Songdo Evaluation Committee. Student recruiting will be carried out by the Admission Office in cooperation with the Office of Global and International Strategies and the Songdo Global University Campus Foundation.

   Gil Brown, University Chief Budget Officer, and Renate Guilford, Associate Provost of Enrollment Planning and Administration, have worked closely with Jack Censer, Jorge Haddock, Alison O’Brien, and Nicole Sealey on the sizing and staging of program cohorts to develop the projected enrollments.

   It should be noted that Mason expects to recruit heavily in China and in Southeast Asia for this program. Tens of thousands of Chinese students regularly enroll in Korean universities. As the Director of the Institute for International Education recently pointed out, that ever-increasing numbers of Chinese students are pursuing their education abroad is linked to the lack of available spaces at Chinese Universities. Members of the Mason’s Office of Admissions and Mason’s Songdo Planning Team are currently in discussions with
the Washington Post subsidiary, Kaplan, on a recruitment plan that will bring high numbers of academically-qualified Chinese students to Mason’s Korea campus beginning in 2013.

b. What is the best estimate of the minimum and maximum number of students?
   We are working with the central planning committee to answer this question.

c. What are the best and worst estimates of annual retention rates?
   We are working with the central planning committee to answer this question.

d. What is the minimum enrollment that we must have to launch this program?
   We are working with the central planning committee to answer this question.

e. By what point must we have this minimum enrollment?
   We are working with the central planning committee to answer this question.

f. Will the low birth rate in Korea affect recruitment for this campus?
   That South Korea’s birthrate is among the lowest in the world is widely known. Still, the impact of on-going decline in the birth rate for Mason’s proposed Korea campus is expected to be minimal. According to the Korea Educational Development Institute (a government-funded institution), there are currently 3.8 million undergraduate and graduate students in Korea enrolled in 40 public universities and 400 private colleges. It should be noted that this number does not include the large number of Korean students who are already studying in foreign universities (see graph below). A recent article in the Chronicle of Higher Education quoted the Education Minister’s warning that “student enrollment at Korean colleges will plummet by 40 percent in the next 12 years.” Yet even a 40 percent decline will leave a pool to be tapped of 2.28 million undergraduate and graduate students in Korea. Furthermore, Mason expects to recruit heavily in China and in Southeast Asia. Mason’s proposed programs of study – Economics, Management, and Global Affairs – are in three of the four most highly sought fields of study by East Asians, as revealed by our market study and by the Open Doors Report.

Figure 1.
2. Academic Curriculum for the degree programs:

   a. We would like to see the semester by semester planned course programs for each of the initial three majors proposed.

   **Table 1. George Mason Korea Academic Program Plan (Draft)**

   **Global Affairs, Economics, Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Gen Ed/Major/Other Requirements</th>
<th>GLOBAL AFFAIRS</th>
<th>ECON</th>
<th>SOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGH 101</td>
<td>ENGH 101</td>
<td>ENGH 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMM 100</td>
<td>COMM 100</td>
<td>COMM 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROV 103</td>
<td>PROV 103</td>
<td>PROV 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GLOA 101</td>
<td>GLOA 101 (PROV105)</td>
<td>GLOA 101 (PROV105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ECON 103</td>
<td>ECON 103 MReq</td>
<td>ECON 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 125</td>
<td>HIST 125</td>
<td>HIST 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   | Semester 2 |                                 | MATH 113       | MATH 113 MReq | MATH 113 |
   |            |                                 | ENGH 122       | ENGH 122 | ENGH 122 |
   |            |                                 | PROV 106       | PROV 106 | PROV 106 |
   |            |                                 | ECON 104       | ECON 104 MReq | ECON 104 |
   |            |                                 | IT 103         | IT 103 MReq | IT 103 |
   | TOTAL      |                                 | 16             | 16      | 16   |

<p>| Semester 3 |                                 | ENGH 201       | ENGH 201 (3)       | ENGH 201 (3) |
|            |                                 | NAT SCI (4)    | NAT SCI (4)       | ACCT 203 (3) SOMP&amp;Core |
|            |                                 | GOVT 132 (3)   | MATH 114 (4)     | OM 210 (4) SOMPq&amp;Core |
|            |                                 | Language (6)   | ECON 306 (3) MReq | MGMT 312 (3) MajR1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester 4</td>
<td>NAT SCI (4)</td>
<td>NAT SCI</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELI 211 (3)</td>
<td>ECON 311 (3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>MReq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECON 385 (3)</td>
<td>ECON 330 (3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 5</td>
<td>GOVT 322 (3)</td>
<td>ECON 345 (3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOVT 300 (4)</td>
<td>ECON 347 (3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mi4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 386 (3)</td>
<td>STAT 250 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 6</td>
<td>CULT 320 (3)</td>
<td>ECON 415 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONF 340 (3)</td>
<td>GOVT 334 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mi5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOVT 343 (3)</td>
<td>GOVT 344 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGMT 301 (3)</td>
<td>SOM 301 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mi3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 7</td>
<td>ENGH 302 (3)</td>
<td>ENGH 302 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECON 380 (3)</td>
<td>ECON 380 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECON 306 (3)</td>
<td>ACCT 203 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mi4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCT 301 (3)</td>
<td>ECON 306 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGMT 461 (3)</td>
<td>MGMT 461 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 8</td>
<td>ARTH 200 (3)</td>
<td>ARTH 200 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STAT 350 (3)</td>
<td>STAT 350 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECON 360 (3)</td>
<td>ECON 360 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECON 309 GE</td>
<td>ECON 309 (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOM 498 (3)</td>
<td>GLOA 495 Intern (6)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Note:** Original curriculum plan was developed by the Curriculum Committee (Jack Censer, Alison O’Brien, Philip Wiest, Nicole Sealey, Anne Schiller, Min Park). This curriculum plan draft was revised and updated as of November 17, 2011 by Dee Holisky. SOM is reviewing this version for finalization.

*PROV 103: English Language Support for Public Speaking*

PROV 105: American Culture – It will be offered in Year 2013 as GLOA will be open in Year 2014

PROV 106: Introduction to Research Methods

**Global affairs majors** complete a BA in global affairs with concentration in global economy and management and a minor in economics:

- **M**=major 6
- **C**=concentration 4: GOVT 343; ECON 380; MGMT 461, ECON 360
- **Mi**=minor 7: ECON 103, 104, 306, 335, 309; STAT 250 + 1 ECON of choice

**Economics majors** complete a BS in economics with a minor in international/comparative politics:

- **ME**=major electives 18 courses;
- **Mi**=minor 6 courses: GOVT 103, 132, 336, 347, 444, 343

The academic plan is designed to deliver the general education requirements. First and fourth years completed in Songdo campus and second and fourth years completed in Fairfax campus. Students will complete their general education requirements in their second and third years.

b. We would like these some way be linked the course degree requirements for these majors. We agree.

3. Students:

a. Do Chinese students need visas for studying in Korea?

Yes, they do need visas to study in Korea. According to MEST, there are 57,783 Chinese students in Korean universities as of 2010. The procedure is similar to what American colleges do to issue student visa. Student visa type is D2 and students can apply to Korean Embassy with the required documents, which include 1) original letter of admission from University, 2) passport, 3) original educational document with photo copies, and 4) bank statement.

b. Will these Chinese students have issues in gaining a visa to study in the U.S. in years 2 and 3?

We are working with Christina Lehnertz at OIPS regarding a visa type to be issued for students from the Songdo branch campus. They will need either F-1 or J-1 visas but it is likely that Mason will issue the J-1 visa as it can require students to go back to the branch campus in Korea to complete their fourth year. Mason’s China 1-2-1 program also uses the J-1 visa type and it reduces the risk or issues of rejection rate because of the nature of the J-1 visa.
4. Incheon Free Economic Zone Authority (IFEZA):
   a. What is the relationship of IFEZA to the national government of Korea?
   Incheon Free Economic Zone Authority is a local government entity under Incheon Metropolitan City. Incheon Free Economic Zone (IFEZ) is one of six FEZs in Korea and is an area specially designated pursuant to the “Act on Designation and Management of Free Economic Zones,” which was effective as of July 1, 2003. FEZ provides companies with an optimal environment to engage in global business activities (Free Economic Zones, http://www.fez.go.kr/en/why-fez/whats-fez.jsp). Development, operation, and investor support are proceeding in accordance with the “Act on Designation and Management of Free Economic Zones”. FEZ Committees (Planning Office of FEZ) under Ministry of Knowledge Economy (MKE) draw up policies while local governments (FEZ Authorities, for example, IFEZA) pursue FEZ development, attract foreign investment, and implement projects.

   b. Is there support at the national level for the Songdo Global University?
The establishment of the Songdo Global University Campus is a highly visible national project that can only take place with the support of the Korean central government. Like mentioned above, the Incheon Free Economic Zone (IFEZ) is one of six FEZs in Korea and is an area specially designated pursuant to the central government’s “Act on Designation and Management of Free Economic Zones,” which was effective as of July 1, 2003. The Incheon Free Economic Zone project is a large and long-term project beyond Songdo Global University Campus. The project period began in 2003 and is scheduled for completion in 2020. The funds that Mason will receive to support its participation in the project come in large part from the Korean Ministry of Knowledge Economy (equivalent to US Department of Commerce which drives economic development in the country). To enable foreign universities such as Mason to operate in Korea, the Korean National Congress passed a special law. Had no special law had been passed, no foreign universities would be allowed to open and operate in Korea. The fact that SGUC institutions such as Mason, SUNY, Ghent, and Utah need approval at the national level (accreditation approval from the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST), is another demonstration of central government support for and involvement in this project. The SGUC project has already required enormous infrastructural investment by Korea.

   c. What is the relationship of the Songdo Global University Foundation to IFEZA?
IFEZA is a large government entity responsible for development of IFEZ (consisting of three cities, Songdo, Cheongra, Yeongjong) and for recruiting investments, foreign companies, and universities beyond the SGUC Foundation. The Foundation will be the entity responsible for operation and management of the Songdo Global University Campus. The assignment of student and faculty housing, building maintenance, facilities including the bookstore, cafeteria, and parking garages all come under its purview. The Foundation was legislated by Incheon Metropolitan City Government. Legislation to create the Foundation was passed in October, 2010. The Foundation will be officially launched by the end of this year and will begin to organize its staff. As a first step, the Mayor of Incheon Metropolitan City appointed Dr. Dong Sung Cho as President of the Foundation. Dr. Cho is a senior professor at the School of Management at Seoul National University.
5. Financial Feasibility Questions (see attached memo to Gil Brown from Bob Johnston dated 12 November 2011)
   Answers will be in a separate paper. Some answers are pending as they have to come from the SGUC Foundation, which is not officially active yet.

Prepared by Bob Johnston
29 November 2011
Answers Prepared by Min Park
Director of Proposed Korea Campus Operations
30 November 2011

To: Gil Brown, Chief Budget Officer
From: Bob Johnston
Re: Thoughts Regarding Future Space Costs and Related Issues Songdo Campus
Date: 12 November 2011

Gil,

In following up on our telephone conversation yesterday, this is my attempt to structure some questions we might raise with the Songdo Global University Foundation as the operating entity regarding our future space costs at the Songdo campus.

Common Space and Services (used by all the Universities):
1. For the common space, will we be expected to contribute to the recovery of the capital investment required to construct these facilities? If so, how will this be done and what will be the projected annual contributions and recovery period? If not, how are these funds to be recovered? (If they are to be recovered via student fees, then we may need to include this as factor in student demand.)
2. For the common space, what will be the expected annual contributions for maintenance of the facilities and utilities?
3. Other operating costs (included personnel) for the common space. Beyond maintenance and utilities, how will the other annual operating costs for the common space be allocated and what are the estimates for these costs?
4. Would we need to plan to fund library resources for our students?
5. How will information technology resources be funded? What might we expect to pay for these resources?
6. For all of the common space costs, I believe we want these to be based upon their total target FTE of 10,000 students. We want to contribute these on a per student FTE basis that we generate. If we have a 1,000 FTE students and the total FTE is only 5,000 instead of their 10,000 target, we do not want to get stuck with 20% of the total costs.

George Mason University Instructional and Program Space:
1. What are the projections per square meter or square foot for instructional space at the end of five years? What should we assume regarding annual increases in these costs?
2. Given the three programs that we are proposing, I do not believe any of these would require extraordinary labs or highly specialized space. I am assuming that we would plan on these students completing science courses that require specialized lab space while at the Fairfax campus.
3. I do not think we will need a great deal of instructional space given the number of students we are projecting. However, we may need to plan on more space than we require if their intent is to build a separate building for us.

Student Space (dormitories and eating facilities):
1. What are the projected costs of these facilities for students beginning in 2013?
2. What are the assumptions regarding growth in these costs?
3. I expect this may be important as these costs will be part of the total costs of matriculating at the Songdo campus and impact upon demand.

Student Support Services:
1. As I understand it, student support services are to be provided centrally. What will the per student charge for these services?
2. Will these be part of the cost of dormitory space or a separate item?
3. If separate, what are the assumed future growth rates?

Faculty Housing Space:
1. Is there a projection for the cost of faculty housing at the end of five years? If so, what is the projection and assumed future growth rates?
2. If there are no projections, then what are current market rates for similar properties nearby? What are the historical annual growth rates for these properties?

I expect there are other items I should have included, but hopefully this will give us a start. I would be glad to discuss if you think it would be helpful.

To get a quick estimate of a possible annual capital cost of the large common facility currently under construction, I put together the very simple Excel model that is attached. As you will note, it is set up so that any of the key assumption might be changed.

Bob