GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FEBRUARY 5, 2014
Robinson Hall B113, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.


Senators Absent: Peggy Agouris, Kenneth Ball, Alok Berry, Deborah Boehm-Davis, Ángel Cabrera, Lloyd Cohen, Helen Frederick, Mark Ginsberg, Ghassan Husseinali, Bruce Johnsen, Ning Li, Stuart Malawer, Daniel Menascé, Sarah Nutter, James Olds, Paula Petrik, Daniel Polsby, Thomas Prohaska, William Reeder, Mark Rozell, Peter Stearns, Iosif Vaisman, Jenice View, John Zenelis.

Visitors Present: LaMan Dantzler, Associate University Registrar for Certification; Professor Rick Diecchio, Geology/Atmospheric, Oceanic and Earth Sciences; Patricia Donini, Employee Relations Director/Deputy Director Human Resources; Kim Eby, Associate Provost for Faculty Development/Director, Teaching & Faculty Excellence Center; Esther Elstun, Professor emerita, Modern and Classical Languages; Kimberly Ford, Personnel Project Manager, Enrollment Plan. & Admin, Provost's Office; Linda Harber, Associate Vice President, Human Resources & Payroll; Claudia Holland, Chair, Librarians’ Council; Kimberly Holmes, Director, Retention and Student Success, Student Academic Affairs, Advising and Retention; Megan Kirk, Staff Senate; Michelle Lim, Human Resources Faculty Business Partner, Human Resources & Payroll; Michelle Marks, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs; Tim Murphy, Director, DOIT, Classroom and Lab Technologies; Janette Muir, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education; Sharon Pitt, Interim Executive Director, Technology Systems Division; Diane Smith, Associate University Librarian, Research & Educational Service/ Chair, Task Force on Textbook Affordability; Professor Jim Sanford, Psychology; Sarah Steadman, Faculty and Academic Coordinator, English Language Institute; Bethany Usher, Director, Students as Scholars, OSCAR/Associate Director, Center for Teaching and Faculty Excellence.

I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m.

II. Approval of the Minutes of December 4, 2013: The minutes were approved.

III. Announcements

On behalf of Provost Stearns, Associate Provost Michelle Marks announced 33 freshmen will be entering the Songdo Korea campus in March., along with six students from Mason this year. There is not a signed contract for the INTO program, work is going on. The plan is to start taking students in the fall.

SLOAN Funding Retirement Program: Chair Douglas noted this is a new program including individual coaching for 9 or 12 month faculty within five years of retirement. See Attachment A for more information.

IV. Unfinished Business

Resolution from the General Education Committee – Janette Muir, Chair

Associate Provost Muir thanked the Faculty Senate for the opportunity to continue the discussion from the previous meeting, and to frame the discussion more. At the last meeting (December 4, 2013), the Faculty Senate
voted to approve revisions to the General Education Committee’s charge (including name change to Mason Core Committee). We are also looking at double-counting and counting up to six credits in a couple different categories to bring to the Faculty Senate at a future date. We are also working on the ability to follow engagement pathways, providing co-curricular opportunities, and graduation recognition. By the end of today, she hoped we can look at the spirit of the resolution, not quibble over words; to decide whether this is a good idea.

The Mason Core: Capstone Experience

Rationale and Description

Over the past year, members of the Mason Core committee have extensively discussed the synthesis requirement and what might be a better way to provide a culminating experience for students that is more connected to their degree path. As a result, the full committee unanimously recommended that the Synthesis Requirement be changed to a Capstone Experience.

Each major or program will designate a capstone experience (3-credit minimum) as the final element of the Mason Core. The capstone experience cannot serve other MC requirements. While it should engage the Mason Vision, its primary development and assessment reside with each local academic unit. The capstone experience should encourage students to apply their knowledge and problem-solving skills to pressing intellectual and social problems as ethical inquiry-based citizens, and self-reflective learners. Collaborative partnerships for interdisciplinary courses may be acceptable for this category.

Requirements for the Capstone Experience

Students must have earned a minimum of 85 hours before taking the Capstone Experience course.

As a culminating experience in a major or program, it is expected that the maximum enrollment in a capstone course not exceed 35 students.

Each capstone experience must include a creative or scholarly product that can be reviewed by external audiences. These products may be used for the institutional assessment of critical thinking or to highlight the value of the Mason experience.

Capstone Experience – Learning Outcomes

The learning outcomes of the capstone experience will be created by each unit. Outcomes should demonstrate how students have developed the capacities to act as engaged, ethical citizens and well-rounded scholars who are prepared to act in the world.

Examples of possible capstone experiences include, but are not limited to, a final undergraduate thesis or other research project, a public performance, an exhibition of work, an internship, or an experiential learning project. A Capstone Experience can be constructed from a former synthesis course, either within the unit or in other departments.
Implementation

Once this change in requirements is passed by the Faculty Senate, implementation would be reflected in catalog changes for the 2015-2016 academic year. Additionally, departments would have a phase-in period to assess the best choices for their majors. We expect that students will not be able to avail themselves of this new requirement until Fall 2016.

Overall Advantages

- Shifts synthesis to a requirement that is nationally viewed as a “high impact” practice.
- Potentially reduces the number of required credits a student has to take.
- Places the responsibility for a student’s culminating experience with the local academic unit.
- Allows flexibility in terms of best options for student learning.
- Clarifies the assessment process for this Mason Core category.

(See also power-point presentation “Mason’s General Education Program“)

Resolution from the General Education Committee

The general education committee recommends replacing the “Synthesis” requirement with a “Capstone Experience” associated with the major.

Description:

The Mason Core: Capstone Experience

Each major or program will offer a capstone experience as the final element of the Mason Core. While it should engage the Mason Vision, its primary development and assessment reside with the originating degree or program.

Background:

The original intent of the synthesis requirement was to provide a culminating gen ed experience for students. In practice, however, the synthesis requirement has been challenging due to the following:

1. Course taking patterns for students vary, thus synthesis is taken at different times rather than following other gen ed requirements;
2. Many students transfer to Mason with most of their lower level gen ed waived due to general articulation agreements;
3. Many departments currently use a capstone experience to fulfill the synthesis requirement;
4. Assessment results are uneven due to the variety of courses that have been included in this category.

Most importantly,

Shifting to a “capstone experience” located in a student’s major will put the locus of control on a culminating degree experience within the local unit. Therefore, each department can determine, with some modest direction, what learning outcomes work best for their students. This focus also responds to national conversations around the kinds of courses that work best for students as they complete their college degrees.

Some possible examples of capstone experiences:

- Courses that are already required within the major, but can be mapped to learning outcomes for the Mason Core.
- A research based course
- A student practicum or internship
- A current set of synthesis courses already located in a department

Discussion:
A Senator from the College of Science expressed concern about limiting experience to subject majors within one department. We have some synthesis courses with cross pollination of Psychology majors. Internships could be focused on one experience only.

Another Senator submitted the following comments based on the background information from the Mason Core Committee concerning the practical challenges of the Synthesis requirement that the Capstone Experience would replace.

- Course taking patterns for students vary, thus synthesis is taken at different times rather than following other gen ed requirements; COMMENT: The pre-requisite for Synthesis courses is 60-credits, which has been mentioned before as not being enforced (just as the course section enrollment for English 302 is not enforced). How would the pre-requisite of 85 hours for a Capstone be more successfully enforced?
- Many students transfer to Mason with most of their lower level gen ed waived due to general articulation agreements; COMMENT: It is not clear why this is a practical challenge for taking a Synthesis course, nor why a Capstone course would be an improvement.
- Many departments currently use a capstone experience to fulfill the synthesis requirement; COMMENT: Many of these capstone courses now offered might not fulfill the requirements of the proposed Capstone Experience. In any event, offering a capstone instead of a synthesis course is not a practical challenge and is not a reason for all units to offer a capstone.
- Assessment results are uneven due to the variety of courses that have been included in this category. COMMENT: Changing a general education requirement because of uneven assessment results is like the tail wagging the pedagogical dog. This should not be a reason to change from a synthesis to a capstone without trying to improve synthesis courses or assessment first.

Associate Provost Muir: 60 credits is not a synthesis issue. Transfer students do not have the English 302 requirement. Capstone requirements may make it easier for transfer students.

A third Senator: Many departments use capstone experiences. Some do not fulfill this requirement. Would all existing capstone courses have to be changed if reviewed to fit capstone requirement? Capstone courses better suited to small universities, not in larger diverse universities.

A fourth Senator: All students in the School of Health, Recreation, and Tourism have to do internships. They use information learned in multiple courses to make internship successful, multiple skillset.
A fifth Senator spent some time at Oregon State University last summer; it has a large capstone program. Not just for students in transition, also used in graduate education. We talked with those who ran programs over twenty years; enormously competitive among faculty who want to teach capstone courses. Oregon State and other universities have successful experience with capstone programs. Whether we bring multiple disciplines into capstones depends on richness we can offer and teaching students to make transition to working out in the worlds with critical thinking skills, etc. Research backs up success of well-integrated capstone programs.

A sixth Senator noted his department’s capstone experience is also well-integrated.

A seventh Senator: Some chairs in CHSS are absolutely against this. It is a question of resources, ideas – to meet a 35 student limit per course. Using example of one department lacking resources, there are 48 students in classes, an unfunded mandate. Are synthesis courses better as capstone experience? Majors from other departments might not come into our courses. The Senator suggested either we vote NO or send the issue back to the committee.

An eighth Senator who serves on the General Education Committee noted that the committee has talked about this for a year. It is not really helpful to send the motion back to committee without some direction from you.

A ninth Senator suggested we have an open session with department chairs and faculty worried about staffing it.

A tenth Senator: It seems what animates proposal is to make sure our students graduate as informed, interested, and active citizens. He applauds and agrees with central theme of citizenship. He suggested focus in sophomore course, to encourage students to become politically active and to include co-curricular lectures open to entire university, politicians, news media, political/economic analysts, on the structures of our society. There is so much ignorance, apathy, and understandable alienation among students about politics. He noted a survey demonstrating students have no sense of how our government works.

An eleventh Senator would like to continue the discussion, or does it make things more difficult?

Another Senator: To refer back to committee those concerns under discussion here?

Chair Douglas: Referral for open forum to deans and directors to have them understand.

A twelfth Senator: To combine recommendations, if departments choose not to response, to see what kinds of things to ask.

Associate Provost Muir reminded Senators this motion is not coming from the central administration but from your colleagues elected to serve on the General Education Committee. Several town meetings have taken place. There are mechanisms for you to allow feedback.

Some faculty raised their hands in response to question “how many have capstone experience?”

A thirteenth Senator: Large departments would be hard pressed to allow students to do this; need to have options within each department to deal with lots of different aspects.

A fourteenth Senator: How quickly would we have to update our courses?

Associate Provost Muir: For the 2015-16 catalog, but there would be some phase-in.

A fifteenth Senator: If it turns out we don’t move to capstone course, to make some effort that synthesis requirement go to the School of Management. Our students have capstone courses, and also supports citizenship theme.

Associate Provost Muir: There could be a variety of things departments can do. No matter what we do, we will get feedback. She receives feedback saying “We need to fix General Education.” She also expressed her appreciation for all the work the General Education Committee has done.
Chair Douglas: Suggestion to refer back to committee various specifics to be gathered for the General Education Committee’s consideration. Asks “All Faculty Senators in favor of sending motion back to committee to raise your hands?“ By a show of hands, 21 votes in favor (a majority) of sending motion back to committee. Associate Provost Muir encouraged faculty to invite General Education Committee representatives to provide feedback. Chair Douglas added you may also forward suggestions to the Faculty Senate.

V. New Business - Committee Reports

A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee

Academic Policies – no report.

Budget & Resources – Susan Trencher, Chair
We anticipate receipt of the salary data soon.

Faculty Matters – no report.

Nominations
Daniel Houser (CHSS) is nominated to fill a vacancy on the University Space Committee. Tamara Maddox (VSE) is nominated to fill a vacancy on the Mason Core Committee. The nominations were approved and the nominees elected.

B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

Technology Policy Committee – Stanley Zoltek, Chair
We met yesterday with Marilyn Smith, the new CIO. It was a very good meeting. Sharon Pitt addressed recent spam filtering concerns, in which 2 out of 3 spam filers were down. The problem was the result of a license expiration which should not have happened. So the creative technical solution to deal with issue required getting temporary certification for spam filters. Then we could deliver the 18,000 real messages (746,000 spam messages received). About 2.5% of messages received are non-spam. She also encouraged faculty to report problems and to check the Alerts and Outages Page on the ITU website.

Task Force on Textbook Affordability – Kim Eby, Sharon Pitt, and Diane Smith, Chair
The cost of attendance is very important in higher education. Textbook affordability is also an element in this equation as costs are going up. The national average students are paying for textbooks is $1,200/year, GMU’s costs near average. A complex topic, impacts student learning as some students may be downloading in apps, some may choose not to buy book, and some may choose not to take a course. Below is our report and recommendations for best practices. Students are a captive market, as faculty decide textbooks to use. There is some capability to go around and look for other options such as used books and e-texts.

Diane Smith of University Libraries served as chair of the Task Force. We looked at what other libraries in the area were doing. We buy textbooks and place them on reserved. For the fall term we purchased 500 textbooks in the 100-200 course level. For this semester we expanded to include 300-400 course level books. The bookstore cooperated with us by providing list of textbooks. Students may take them out on reserve for two hours. It is my understanding they are fairly well-used. We asked departments to let students know titles available on reserve.
We hope to increase faculty awareness and ask for your help. Is there an existing Faculty Senate Committee to which representatives can report?

Discussion/Questions

A Senator: Where are the textbooks on reserve located? Some General Education courses are held on both (Prince William) campuses.

Diane Smith: In the Johnson Center Library, not yet at Prince William.

A second Senator: The library reserve copies are a terrific idea. How do you alert professors who are teaching they are there? Is there a list posted of what is available?

Diane Smith: It is very difficult to get faculty names, part of communication problem. She suggested faculty include information on syllabus. You have to know the name of textbook and they can look for it; no list is posted.

A third Senator: I order 300 copies of a psychology book, and do not look at costs/availability. How to get this information to faculty about competitors?

A fourth Senator: Was there a representative from the bookstore on the task force? I teach an on-line course and try to give access to e-books, not in bookstore. So, for the third year in a row, he tries to give students directions.

Diane Smith: There was a bookstore representative on the Task Force and we also looked at possibility of Financial Aid office providing vouchers to students; a revenue stream to the university.

A fifth Senator: I teach a big class. Publishers are anxious to sell books; I ask for free copy for library use and often receive one. Also questions about bookstore markup as high as 33%, not 25%, and also to allow bookstore to pay back more on used books.

Sharon Pitt: An RFB is now in development. Faculty may not realize you can ask for free copy.

Diane Smith: How to centralize this information? How to identify on-line free copies?

A sixth Senator: At UCLA all concessions were run by student government. There were a lot of projects, and profit went back to students.

Response: $1M revenue from the bookstore is sent back to academic units.

A fourth Senator: We need to address budget issue, how to replace revenue if we cut costs and kill a revenue stream.

A seventh Senator commended the task force for its really important work, and the library, cross-pollination by professors using same textbooks. He noted communication issues within bookstore where faculty told book out or print and then informed of delay in arrival by February 15th, so he told students to go to Amazon

An eighth Senator noted sometimes it is hard to locate electronic resources, may need to go down 2 or 3 layers in search.

A motion was made to form a committee. The motion was approved. Chair Douglas asked Senators interested in serving on the committee to contact her.
The Provost charged the Task Force on Textbook Affordability in February 2013 to develop a set of recommendations to make textbooks more affordable for Mason students.

Members of the task force were:
- Diane Smith (Chair), Associate University Librarian, Research & Educational Services
- Kimberly Eby, Associate Provost for Faculty Development; Director, Center for Teaching and Excellence
- Rajesh Ganesan, Associate Professor, Systems Engineering and Operations Research
- Star Muir, Associate Professor; Hiring and Scheduling Director, Communication
- Mark Kraner, Executive Director, Campus Retail Operations, Auxiliary Enterprises
- Steve Nodine, Manager of Instructional Design
- Sharon Pitt, Interim Deputy CIO
- Larry Rockwood, Professor of Environmental Science and Policy; Director, Undergraduate Biology Program
- Cliff Shore, Director, Purchasing and Accounts Payable
- Korey Singleton, Manager, Assistive Technology Services
- Jennifer Suh, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education

The task force reviewed the literature to identify trends and discussed possible actions. It is clear that the “problem” exists throughout higher education and that all are looking for the “silver bullet.” The crux of the issue is simple: the person choosing the textbook to be used in a class is not the person who has to pay for the book. The textbook decision is made in a publishing environment of planned obsolescence, in which publishers must continually issue new editions or add additional “learning components” to their products in order to guarantee their revenue stream and grow their businesses. At Mason there is the added economic dilemma that the University receives a revenue stream from the bookstore and reducing costs for students can reduce monies that are funneled back into the academic programs.

Given our research and analysis, the recommendations of the task force are:

- George Mason University should appoint a group focused on developing an awareness program to educate faculty on actions they can take to reduce textbook costs for students.
- George Mason University should develop a parallel marketing effort to inform students of steps that they may take to lower costs.
- George Mason University should incentivize faculty to create and share e-textbooks via an open educational resource (OER) repository.
- George Mason University should encourage experimentation and research with e-textbooks to help faculty transition from print to e-textbook format.
- George Mason University should investigate, join, and actively participate in open educational resource (OER) repositories seeking to understand the number of resources that are valuable to the Mason academic community, the quality of the repository’s content, the value to our learning community, and the beneficial and sustainable impact on textbook affordability for students.
• The Office of Financial Aid should investigate the feasibility of allowing students to allocate a portion of their financial aid to purchase books at the bookstore.

• The University Libraries should develop programs to support the textbook affordability initiative through a textbook reserve project; build a more robust electronic reserve capability; and develop OER expertise within the staff.

• The course textbook information sheet currently used by the bookstore to gather textbook titles should be augmented to include information on how and if the faculty member will support the use of an e-textbook version throughout the class.

• The State Council of Higher Education of Virginia and the Commonwealth of Virginia may play a role in the encouragement of the use of open educational resources, as well as the creation of policy and legislation that encourages publishers to provide affordable access to textbooks, whether printed or electronic. George Mason should work with these groups as appropriate to further the cause and development of open educational resources.


Faculty Handbook Committee  - Suzanne Slayden, Chair

Agenda item from the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee
Faculty Senate meeting, Feb. 5, 2014

Proposed Revisions to the Faculty Handbook
The proposed revisions are those that the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee has been considering at its regular meetings during the 2013-2014 academic year.

At this meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Committee will present the revisions and ask for brief discussion. Afterwards, the Committee will amend the revisions if necessary. At the March 5, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting, the Committee will ask that the proposed revisions be voted on without further change.

The Committee welcomes comments and suggestions before and after the Faculty Senate meeting.
2014 PROPOSED HANDBOOK REVISIONS
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2.4 Criteria for Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Candidates for renewal, promotion and tenure will be evaluated in light of the missions of the University which are teaching—research and scholarship, both theoretical and applied—and service (as defined in Section 2.4.3). Peer review plays a central role in the evaluation of individual achievement in each of these areas. Although candidates are not expected to have equal levels of commitment or equal responsibilities in each of these areas, high competence is expected. Genuine excellence must be exhibited in the areas of either in teaching or in research and scholarship, and in High competence must be exhibited in both areas.

Rationale: Ambiguous plural "areas" is removed. The language is clarified that excellence is required in either of the two areas of teaching or research/scholarship.
2.7.3 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

... The review process is carried out as follows:

1. In departmentalized schools, colleges, or institutes, the first level of review is departmental and the second is conducted by a peer-elected committee of the school, or college, or institute. The second-level review committee can include members from outside the school, college, or institute who are elected in the same manner as other members of the second-level review committee.

2. In non-departmentalized level academic units (i.e., schools, colleges, or institutes) which are subdivided into programs, provided that no program faculty in the unit is smaller than the smallest department of the University, the first level of review is carried out by the program faculty to which the candidate belongs and the second level of review is carried out by a peer-elected committee of the school, college, or institute. The second-level review committee can include members from outside the school, college, or institute who are elected in the same manner as other members of the second-level review committee. In order to qualify to operate under the provisions stated in this paragraph, however, the aforesaid program faculties cannot exist solely to make personnel evaluations.

3. In non-departmentalized level academic units (i.e., schools, colleges, or institutes) which are not further subdivided, the first level review is carried out by eligible faculty in the candidate’s school, college, or institute, and the second level of review is carried out by a peer-elected committee of the school, college, or institute. The second level review committee can include members from outside the school, college, or institute who are elected in the same manner as other members of the second-level review committee.

... Rationale: The revision clarifies how outside members are elected. Each unit specifies in its rules and bylaws who are eligible faculty and how members are elected.
3.3 Summer Salary

The University offers a summer program consisting of several sessions. Full-time faculty members assigned to teach a summer course shall be paid 3.33% per credit hour (10% per three-credit course) of their nine-month salary. If a course is valued at a higher or lower amount for workload purposes during the academic year, the summer payment will be assigned by the academic unit accordingly. Every full-time faculty member who wishes to teach in the summer shall be afforded an opportunity to teach one 3-credit course (or equivalent) at 10% of their annual nine-month salary, assuming he or she is qualified to teach the course and that the course meets minimal enrollment criteria and appropriate scheduling, curricular, and pedagogical needs. Furthermore, full-time faculty should not be excluded from teaching additional courses at 10% of their annual nine-month salary when no demonstrated financial constraints exist. Grievances over what constitutes financial constraints should be resolved at the local level, but if no agreement can be reached, then the Provost and the Faculty Senate’s Executive Committee will be the designated body to resolve the disagreement. Summer teaching is optional, and in no case may it be required of a faculty member.

Regardless of funding sources, faculty may be paid for all summer work may not exceed no more than one third of their prior academic year salary for all summer work, regardless of funding sources. The salary paid per pay period during the summer may not exceed the base salary paid per pay period during the academic year.

Faculty members whose contracts end in the spring semester prior to the start of summer, or whose contracts begin in the fall semester after the summer semester, will be paid for summer teaching according to the salary matrix. Exceptions can only be granted by the Provost Office.

Faculty and LAU administrators on 12-month contracts who teach during the summer do not earn additional pay for teaching unless the teaching assignment is an overload assignment. Overload teaching is paid according to the salary matrix and must be approved by the Provost.

3.3 Summer Salary

The University offers a summer program consisting of several sessions. Full-time faculty members assigned to teach a summer course shall be paid 3.33% per credit hour (10% per three-credit course) of their nine-month salary. If a course is valued at a higher or lower amount for workload purposes during the academic year, the summer payment will be assigned by the academic unit accordingly. Every full-time faculty member who wishes to teach in the summer shall be afforded an opportunity to teach one 3-credit course (or equivalent) at 10% of their annual nine-month salary, assuming he or she is qualified to teach the course and that the course meets minimal enrollment criteria and appropriate scheduling, curricular, and pedagogical needs. Furthermore, full-time faculty should not be excluded from teaching additional courses at 10% of their annual nine-month salary when no demonstrated financial constraints exist. Grievances over what constitutes financial constraints should be resolved at the local level, but if no agreement can be reached, then the Provost and the Faculty Senate’s Executive Committee will be the designated body to resolve the disagreement. Summer teaching is optional, and in no case may it be required of a faculty member.

Regardless of funding sources, faculty pay for all summer work may not exceed no more than one third of their prior academic year salary. The salary paid per pay period during the summer may not exceed the base salary paid per pay period during the academic year.

Faculty members whose contracts end in the spring semester prior to the start of summer, or whose contracts begin in the fall semester after the summer semester, will be paid for summer teaching according to the salary matrix. Exceptions can only be granted by the Provost Office.

Faculty and LAU administrators on 12-month contracts who teach during the summer do not earn additional pay for teaching unless the teaching assignment is an overload assignment. Overload teaching is paid according to the salary matrix and must be approved by the Provost.

Rationale: The revision clarifies and extends the explanation of the limit of faculty summer salary.
Rationale: There is duplicate material in sections 2.1.3 and 2.3.3 that has been largely eliminated by reorganization. There is very little new, changed or deleted material. The main change has been to allow promotion earlier than the 6th year. The information in Section 2.1.3 is organized to roughly parallel the similar Section 2.1.2 “Tenure-Track Appointment”. Section 2.3.3 contains information that is specifically applicable to term appointments. Because the revision is extensive, please read the right-hand column first and consult the original Handbook.

2.1.3 Term Appointments
2.1.3 Other Types of Full-Time Fixed-Term Appointments
Full-time instructional, research, and clinical faculty on fixed-term, non-tenure-track appointments are known as Term Faculty. Service in such positions cannot be applied to consideration for tenure, although a faculty member holding this kind of appointment can subsequently be considered for a tenure-track or tenured appointment.

Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on teaching are appointed as instructional faculty. Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on research are appointed as research faculty. Term faculty whose assignments focus primarily on clinical practice are appointed as clinical faculty. Term faculty may be offered single-year or multi-year contracts up to a maximum of 5 years. Service in such positions cannot be applied to consideration for tenure, although a faculty member holding this kind of appointment can subsequently be considered for a tenure-track or tenured appointment. (See Sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.3.) Some specific administrative or service functions may also be attached to the teaching, research, or clinical focus.

Term faculty may be offered single-year or multi-year contracts, with the maximum contract length for assistant professors being three years for initial appointments and reappointments at the same rank. The maximum contract length for term associate and full professors is five years. Such contracts automatically expire at the end of the contract period, and although they may be renewed, there is no guarantee or right to
reappointment from one contract to the next, whether single-year or multi-year.

Term faculty appointments include appropriate academic rank as judged by the appointing local academic unit and subject to the approval of the appropriate dean/director and Provost. Multi-year term faculty normally must hold a terminal degree. Term faculty with a terminal degree are eligible for promotion in rank normally after six years of service. Multi-year contracts offered after promotion in rank may be for up to five years.

Instructional/Teaching-oriented term faculty may hold one of the following titles: Term Instructor, Term Assistant Professor, Term Associate Professor, or Term Professor. Research-oriented term faculty may hold one of the following titles: Research Instructor, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor. Clinical-oriented term faculty may hold one of the following titles: Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor.

Term faculty on single-year appointments whose permanent employment is with another organization hold title with the prefix of “Visiting.”

2.1.5 Adjunct Appointment

Rationale: This section should be titled “Adjunct Appointment” in parallel with preceding sections. There is no change to the content of the section.

2.1.5 Adjunct Appointment

There is no change to the content of the section.
2.3.3 Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Term Faculty

Term faculty appointments will be explicitly designated as such, and offer letters must clearly state the type and length of appointment, as well as the focus of the appointment, whether instructional, research, or clinical. Some specific administrative or service functions may be attached to the instructional, research, or clinical focus. Faculty on fixed term, non-tenure-track appointments are known as Term Faculty. At the discretion of the respective Dean, such faculty may be offered single-year or multi-year contracts up to a maximum of 5 years. Multi-year term faculty normally hold a terminal degree, as defined by standards in the discipline. Exceptions to either contract length or terminal degree requirements must be approved by the Provost. For initial appointments, the maximum contract length for term assistant professors is three years and for term associate and full professors it is five years. Such contracts automatically expire at the end of the contract period, and although a faculty member may be reappointed, there is no guarantee or right to reappointment from one contract to the next, whether single-year or multi-year.

If a multi-year appointment is offered to a faculty member whose position relies entirely or partially on non-state appropriated funding, then a multi-year contract may be established subject to the continuing availability of funding throughout the contract period. Both the university and the term faculty member retain the option to request a change from a multi-year contract to a single-year contract. This action must be endorsed by the respective dean/director and approved by the Provost.

Term faculty cannot move to a tenure-track or tenured position, either as a direct appointment or as a result of a search, without prior approval of the Provost. Prior Term Faculty appointments will be explicitly designated as such, and offer letters must clearly state the type, and length of appointment, as well as the focus of the appointment.
whether teaching, research, or clinical. Some specific administrative or service functions may be attached to the teaching, research, or clinical focus. Multi-year appointments must be made at the rank appropriate to the credentials of the individual. Initial appointments cannot exceed three years for Term Assistant Professors and five years for Term Associate Professors and Term Professors. Multi-year Term Faculty normally hold a terminal degree, as defined by standards in the discipline. Exceptions to either contract length or terminal degree requirements must be approved by the Provost.

A faculty member holding this type of appointment can subsequently be considered for a tenure-track appointment or a tenured appointment; however, prior service on a fixed-term, externally-funded appointment is not applied to tenure consideration unless specified in the tenure-track letter of appointment.

Tenure-track faculty cannot move to a term position, either as a direct appointment or as a result of a search, without prior approval of the Provost. [See Section 2.3.2.] This procedure will only be considered in exceptional circumstances.

A maximum of 35% of all Instructional Term Faculty within the University may be on multi-year contracts and a maximum of 25% of all full-time Instructional Faculty within the University may be Term Faculty.

### 2.3.3.1 Reappointment

Criteria for reappointment will emphasize strong performance in areas designated in the initial contract letter.

**Single-year Contracts**

Instructional, Research, and Clinical Term Faculty on single-year contracts will be evaluated annually for reappointment. The terms “reappoint” or “reappointment” in this Handbook mean offering a term faculty member an additional contract for an additional term or terms.

2.3.3.1 Reappointment

The terms “reappoint” or “reappointment” in this Handbook mean offering a term faculty member a contract for an additional term or terms, which may include the same or different duties and responsibilities. Term assistant professors may receive a one, two or three-year reappointment. Term associate and full professors may be reappointed to contracts of up to five years.
which may include the same or different duties and responsibilities. Term assistant professors may receive a one, two or three-year reappointment. Instructional Term associate and full professors may be reappointed. Faculty will be notified in writing of the University’s decision to contracts of up to appoint no later than 3 months prior to the last day of the term of their initial contracts, and no later than 5 months prior to the last day of the term of subsequent contracts. Research and Clinical Term Faculty will be notified in writing of the University’s decision to reappoint no later than 3 months prior to the last day of the term of their contracts. In the fifth year of five years.

Consecutive, single-year contracts, a Term Faculty member must be evaluated using the procedure outlined below for Term Faculty on multi-year contracts in the final year of their initial contracts, and must be notified in writing of the decision whether or not to reappoint. Term faculty on single-year contracts will be evaluated annually for reappointment; are eligible for promotion in rank following the criteria and timeline outlined below for term faculty on multi-year contracts.

Multi-year Contracts

Term Faculty on multi-year contracts will be evaluated for reappointment during the final year of their contract appointments. Term faculty are evaluated by the local unit administrator and/or a local academic unit faculty committee. Criteria for reappointment will emphasize strong performance in those areas designated in the initial and any subsequent contract letters. Based on that evaluation and programmatic needs, the dean/director will recommend whether or not to reappoint.

Recommendations for instructional term faculty are due to the Provost usually by November 1st of the final year of the current contract. For research and clinical term faculty, this recommendation is usually due no later than 5 months prior to the last day of the contract term.

The Provost will make the final determination and notify instructional term faculty members, in writing, usually no later than 3 months prior to the last day of the term of their initial contracts, and usually no later than 5 months prior to the last day of the term of subsequent contracts. The Provost will make the final determination and notify research and clinical term faculty members, in writing, usually no later than 3 months prior to the last day of the term of their contracts.
of the current, multi-year contract. For research and clinical term faculty, this recommendation is usually due no later than five (5) months prior to the last day of the contract term.

The Provost will make the final determination and notify instructional term faculty advise Instructional Term Faculty members, in writing, usually no later than 3 months prior to the last day of the term of their initial contracts, and usually no later than 5 months prior to the last day of subsequent their contracts. The Provost will make the final determination and notify research and clinical term faculty advise the Research Term Faculty members, in writing, usually no later than 3 months prior to the last day of the term of their contracts.

2.3.3.2 Promotion
A term faculty member
b. If the decision is made to reappoint faculty at the assistant professor rank may receive a one, two or three year reappointment. Term associate and full professors may be reappointed to contracts of up to five years.
c. In the Term Faculty member’s sixth year or thereafter, he or she may be (i) considered for promotion, normally after six years to the rank of Term associate professor, and reappointment to a contract of service, up to five years or (ii) for reappointment to a contract of up to three years at his/her current rank. Candidates for promotion to associate professor must demonstrate at least high competence in the focus area (instructional, teaching, research, or clinical) by the standards developed by the local academic unit and approved by the Provost. Candidates for promotion to full professor must demonstrate genuine excellence in the focus area (instructional, teaching, research, or clinical) by the standards developed by the local academic unit and approved by the Provost. The recommendation for promotion is due to the Provost by November 1st. By the end of fall semester (no later than December 15th), the Provost will notify the faculty member, in writing, of a decision whether or not to recommend promotion.

Term faculty who are promoted will be announced to the Board of Visitors.
d. By the end of fall semester of the final year of the current multi-year contract (no later than December 15th), the Provost will notify the faculty Term Faculty member, in writing, of a decision whether or not to recommend promotion or reappointment at the current rank.

e. Term faculty who are promoted will be announced to the Board of Visitors and may be appointed to a contract of up to five years at their new rank.

f. Term Associate Professors will be evaluated for reappointment to additional contracts in the final year of each contract, following the same time frame and procedures outlined above. They may also be considered for promotion to Term Full Professors.

g. Both the University and the Term Faculty member retain the option to request a change from a multi-year contract to a single-year contract. This action must be endorsed by the respective Dean/Director and approved by the Provost.

h. Term faculty cannot move to a tenure-track position without prior approval of the Provost and after appropriate faculty review. Normally, this must involve a search process.

i. Tenure-track faculty cannot move to a term position without prior approval of the Provost and appropriate faculty review. This procedure will only be considered in exceptional circumstances and normally would involve a search process.
2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty

All faculty are evaluated annually by the local unit administrators and/or a local academic unit faculty committee committees of peers who report to the dean/director/deans and directors or the Provost. The criteria for the annual faculty review are the same as those listed in Section 2.3.3.2 (Term Faculty) and Section 2.4 (Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty) except that the evaluation is based upon the contributions of the preceding academic year and, where applicable, the summer. Faculty are evaluated on the quality of their overall performance and in the context of their goals and assignments. The results of and rationale for the evaluation must be given to the faculty member in writing; and faculty members must be afforded the opportunity to discuss the results of the evaluation.

Annual evaluations are the primary basis for determining salary increases (see Section 3.2). Local unit administrators may take into account performance evaluations over multiple years in making raise recommendations.

Rationale: This section, which is not part of the term appointment sections, is revised since it mentions both term faculty and the section (which is now renumbered).

2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty

All faculty are evaluated annually by the local unit administrator and/or a local academic unit faculty committee who report to the dean/director or the Provost. The criteria for the annual faculty review are the same as those listed in Section 2.3.3.2 (Term Faculty) and Section 2.4 (Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty) except that the evaluation is based upon the contributions of the preceding academic year and, where applicable, the summer. Faculty are evaluated on the quality of their overall performance and in the context of their goals and assignments. The results of and rationale for the evaluation must be given to the faculty member in writing; and faculty members must be afforded the opportunity to discuss the results of the evaluation.

Annual evaluations are the primary basis for determining salary increases (see Section 3.2). Local unit administrators may take into account performance evaluations over multiple years in making raise recommendations.
2.11.2 Grievances

2.11.2.1 Policies Concerning Grievances

This section does not apply to the resolution of (1) research and scholarship misconduct allegations, which are governed by University Policy 4007 – Misconduct in Research and Scholarship, http://universitypolicy.emu.edu/4007res.html; or (2) allegations of discrimination, which are investigated by the Office of Equity and Diversity Services, Compliance, Diversity and Ethics; or (3) alleged violations of academic freedom related to reappointment, promotion or tenure, for which Section 2.8 applies.

The university and each college, school and academic institute are required to have a standing committee charged to investigate internal grievances in a timely manner concerning (i) alleged violations of academic freedom; (ii) other conditions of employment, such as work assignments, salaries, facilities, and support services (except for grievances related to Discontinuation of Degree Programs, Sections 2.9.2 and Termination for Cause, Section 2.9.3); and (iii) charges of unprofessional or unethical conduct brought by one faculty member against another. Each college, school and academic institute will establish, publish, and disseminate their grievance procedures.

Rationale: The first paragraph above was moved from the end of this section, and (3) is moved here from the end of the last section.

The Office of Equity and Diversity Services is now the Office of Compliance, Diversity Ethics.
College, school and academic institute committees hear grievances from faculty whose primary affiliation is within the college, school or academic institute. The University Grievance Committee hears all grievances that involve faculty from more than one college, school or institute as well as other grievances mandated in the committee charge. The University Grievance Committee hears all grievances against academic administrators at or above the level of deans and directors. See Section 2.11.2.2 (4-6).

The University Grievance Committee and each college, school and academic institute grievance committee will establish, publish, and disseminate their grievance procedures. In all types of cases, procedures will reflect the fundamental principle of due process, including the prohibition of people sitting in judgment of their own actions. These committees are particularly charged to be alert to instances of inequitable treatment and retaliation against colleagues who have filed grievances. Upon receipt of a grievance that includes an allegation of violation of federal or state law, or discrimination in violation of federal or state civil rights laws, or University non-discrimination regulations policy, the grievance hearing shall be held in abeyance until the Office of Compliance, Diversity and Ethics has investigated the allegation and has submitted a report to the committee.

Rationale: The language on violation of law or discrimination is parallel to that found in the P&T Appeals section, making it consistent across the Faculty Handbook.

Not all of the grievances currently in the charge for the University Grievance Committee are listed in order to allow flexibility in changing the Committee’s charge without having to change the Faculty Handbook.
The University grievance committee hears all grievances against administrators at or above the level of deans and directors. See Section 2.11.2.2 (4.6).

In addition to hearing specific cases, the committees may initiate, as they deem necessary, discussions with appropriate administrators about any matters that fall within the committees' purview. In the course of such discussions, however, they may not commit the faculties of their units to changes in grievance policy unless specifically authorized to do so.

At their discretion, academic departments may also establish grievance committees. Their procedures should be similar to those of the collegiate committees.

This section on “Policies Concerning Grievances” does not apply to the resolution of (1) research and scholarship misconduct allegations, which is governed by University Policy 1007 — Misconduct in Research and Scholarship [https://universitypolicies.unm.edu/1007_research], or (2) allegations of discrimination, which are investigated by the Office of Equity and Diversity Services.

2.11.2.2 Grievance Procedures

The following procedures apply to all grievances:

1. Grievance procedures for all Grievance Committees must adhere to the following basic elements.

a. The faculty member initiates a grievance by filing a written statement of the grievance, along with supporting documentation, with the Chair of the relevant Grievance Committee. No grievance may be heard on behalf of a third party or group.

In addition to hearing specific cases, the committees may initiate, as they deem necessary, discussions with appropriate administrators about any matters that fall within the committees' purview. In the course of such discussions, however, they may not commit the faculties of their units to changes in grievance policy unless specifically authorized to do so.

At their discretion, academic departments may also establish grievance committees. Their procedures should be similar to those of the collegiate committees.

2.11.2.2 Grievance Procedures

1. Grievance procedures for all Grievance Committees must adhere to the following basic elements.

a. The faculty member initiates a grievance by filing a written statement of the grievance, along with supporting documentation, with the Chair of the relevant Grievance Committee. No grievance may be heard on behalf of a third party or group.
b. Before the grievance itself is considered, the committee must conclude that the petitioner’s case appears to have merit.

c. The faculty member may withdraw the grievance at any time without the Grievance Committee’s approval. In such case, the Grievance Committee will not make a decision or recommendation.

d. No member of the committee with a conflict of interest in the grievance case may participate in the proceedings.

Before the grievance itself is considered, the committee must conclude that the petitioner’s case appears to have merit.

In all types of cases, procedures will reflect the fundamental principle of due process including the prohibition of people sitting in judgment of their own actions. These

e. Committees are particularly charged to be alert to instances of inequitable treatment and retaliation against colleagues who have filed grievances.

2. Within a college, school, or institute, grievances against fellow faculty members and academic administrators below the level of dean/director are heard by the local grievance committee.

a. If such a case is made and the grievance is against a fellow faculty member, the committee is charged to investigate the facts of the case and determine an appropriate resolution for the case. The grievance committee’s decision is final.

b. Before the grievance itself is considered, the committee must conclude that the petitioner’s case appears to have merit.

c. The faculty member may withdraw the grievance at any time without the Grievance Committee’s approval. In such case, the Grievance Committee will not make a decision or recommendation.

d. No member of the committee with a conflict of interest in the grievance case may participate in the proceedings.

e. Committees are particularly charged to be alert to instances of inequitable treatment and retaliation against colleagues who have filed grievances.

Rationale: There is some re-wording of existing guidelines, and the addition of a couple more.
c. In cases of alleged violations of academic freedom, the faculty of the college, school or institute acts on its grievance committee’s recommendation by formal vote, the outcome of which is final.

b. If the grievance is against an academic administrator below the level of dean/director, the committee is charged to investigate the facts of the case and to recommend a resolution, which is then forwarded to the dean or institute director, whose decision is final.

c. In cases of alleged violations of academic freedom, the faculty of the college, school or institute acts on its grievance committee’s recommendation by formal vote, the outcome of which is final.

Rationale: the two paragraphs, b. and c. above, are switched since both “fellow faculty” and “administrators” are mentioned in the main paragraph and so handling them appears sequentially. In the now third paragraph, whoever is charged with violation of academic freedom, the case is resolved differently.

3. Grievances against academic administrators at or above the level of dean/director are heard by the University Grievance Committee.
a. If the grievance is against a dean/director, the University Grievance Committee hears the case. Its committee’s recommendation is forwarded to the Provost, whose decision is final.

**Rationale:** this is not consistent with the jurisdiction in the earlier section and so deleted.

b. If the grievance is against the Provost, the University Grievance Committee’s recommendation is forwarded to the President, whose decision is final.

c. If the grievance is against the President, the University Grievance Committee’s recommendation is forwarded to the Rector of the Board of Visitors, whose decision is final.

In cases of alleged violations of academic freedom (except those related to matters of promotion and tenure, for which Section 2.8 applies), the faculty of the college, school or institute acts on its grievance committee’s recommendation by formal vote, the outcome of which is final.

a. If the grievance is against a dean/director, the committee’s recommendation is forwarded to the Provost, whose decision is final.

b. If the grievance is against the Provost, the committee’s recommendation is forwarded to the President, whose decision is final.

c. If the grievance is against the President, the committee’s recommendation is forwarded to the Rector of the Board of Visitors, whose decision is final.
V. Other New Business – none.

VI. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty

A paternity leave bill has been submitted to the State Senate.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter Pober
Secretary
Within 5 years of retirement? 9 or 12-month faculty?

FACULTY RETIREMENT COACHING

Let us assist you in developing personal goals for life in retirement and design your own transition plan.

Includes:

- Online retirement readiness assessment
- Two individual coaching sessions with a certified retirement coach
- Two informative seminars (one 1/2 day and one full day)

Your spouse/partner is welcome to attend the seminars.

For questions and to register, please contact Kathy Haldeman at khaldem1@gmu.edu or 3.2040.

Pilot program funded by the ACE/Sloan Retirement Transitions Award.