I. **Call to Order:** Chair Keith Renshaw called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

II. **Approval of the Minutes of September 7, 2016:** The minutes were approved.

III. **Announcements**

Chair Renshaw introduced Rector Tom Davis. He is here for discussion and welcomes questions from Senators. Salaries: We know state news was disappointing. The BOV is determined to find a way to get you a raise. We will do the best we can at the next BOV meeting (October 13, 2016), noting legal constraints. The BOV made this its highest priority. You’re the greatest asset we have at this university – to keep up conversation.

Senator: We all know and appreciate salaries are given highest priorities. Also we should not forget the staff. Some have been here a long time, do a lot of work and need to be happy too.

Rector Davis: There are a lot of issues before the BOV; the #1 issue is money. The endowment has doubled in the last 5 years and fundraising goals have been exceeded. Exciting opportunities lie ahead;
we are thinking bigger, moonshot, more scholarships and pay faculty what they are worth. We will continue to bounce ideas off of you. Five or six Supreme Court justices are coming for the dedication of the Antonin Scalia Law School tomorrow.

Senator: What is your vision of faculty engagement? Vision of involvement?

Rector Davis: First of all, deans are part of this. Sometimes contributions come forward and donors request anonymity. Last time not everybody agreed; the BOV heard from Faculty Representatives to BOV Committees, and the chair of the Faculty Senate. Everyone had different objectives, but we can sit and talk and dialogue. We’re open to all ideas – with respect to all intellectuals, including Antonin Scalia. We want to engage you as early as we can.

Senator: Thank you for coming. The most central discussion, even more important than money --- regards issues of who makes the decision. A 1966 policy statement formulated by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards divided up areas of university who had the primary control over certain issues. The faculty is given primary control of teaching (curriculum) and research. Teaching and research are the heart of the institution; faculty judgment should be taken very seriously. This was amended by the Association of Governing Boards and endorsed by all three of these groups.

Rector Davis: The BOV has fiduciary responsibility. Our fiduciary responsibility continues even in time of declining funding coming to colleges; there are long term and short term implications. We have tough decisions to make. I am happy to continue to come here and bring other Visitors if you like.

Senator: You mentioned previously you were an adjunct professor. Seven colleges exceed 25% limit on term faculty in the Faculty Handbook. How do you see that changing here? (See Faculty Handbook, Section 2.3.3 –Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Term Faculty, p. 25).

Rector Davis: I will let Provost Wu address this. I teach for free – offer a lot of experience with a unique perspective, and on the job training. I am not a full time professor, and I do not want to be a full time professor. In DC there are folks with unique areas of expertise. Adjuncts relieve some of the burden on you to teach, but they do not get certain benefits like retirement. Some colleges have adjunct limits related to accreditation; we will not exceed that.

Provost Wu: A forum for adjunct faculty to address this head on. Relatively poor data on composition of adjunct population – survey done and disseminating outcome. Common perception of adjuncts not quite accurate. The majority are either working professionals, or retired workers with pensions. What motivates them to come is they want to engage with students and university – salary not #1 concern.

Rector Davis: There are larger questions to consider. We want to get data and we want your input. Adjuncts are not to displace you but to lighten your load.

Senator: There are also term faculty with drastically different working conditions – they are vastly overworked and underpaid; they are trying to make a living. To broaden our view, we need to look at how teaching faculty impact the university. Teaching and research now segregated – How to get more students engaged in scholarship and research? A fundamental problem in division of labor in the university.
Rector Davis welcomes this discussion and is happy to address this complex problem. At the end of the day the job of the BOV is to pay salaries and raise revenue.

Senator: Emphasis on revenue side – what about cost side?

Rector Davis: Eliminate courses without student demand in some cases – BOV looks at this before we look at tuition increase.

Senator follow up: Five years ago the University of Maryland eliminated eight varsity sports to cut costs. Substantial savings of money.

Rector Davis: There is a BOV subcommittee looking at this. We want a well-rounded university.

Senator follow up: Handwringing on student debt – each FTE student here pays $550/annually in fees. Why not give students option to pay this? Give them the opportunity to choose.

Rector Davis: There are Title IX restrictions on this.

Senator: Were Graduate Lecturers included in the survey of adjuncts?
Provost Wu: Yes statistics included Graduate Lecturers.

Rector Davis: Happy to discuss further with you – we embrace diversity of opinion, not just dollars and cents. Also ratings, reputations, Law School LSAT scores went up this year.

Provost David Wu presented his goals for AY 2016-17. He could not be here for the first Faculty Senate meeting as he attended a building dedication at the Korean campus. We have a brand new seven-story building in Inchon. Enrollment has improved significantly; altogether a little over 400 students. All (South Korean) males go to military service for one year – taking leave of absence during their junior/senior year. More or less meets our target. Spent a lot of time with the faculty when I was there, had lunch and open sessions with them. First, they want to be more involved, included in Mason faculty at large. We will do everything we can to make this happen. Second, Dr. Steven Lee, President of Mason Korea campus and chief CIO will make a presentation at next week’s APDUC (BOV Committee on Academic Policies, Diversity and University Community Committee) meeting. Provost Wu encouraged faculty to attend; it is an open meeting. The CFO will make financial projections for the next 3-5 years. BOV is interested in this too.

Context of Provost Goals: At the July BOV retreat, President Cabrera presented his goals for the coming year. The BOV has to approve this – some back and forth – so what you see in the Provost list of goals contains 22 of the 29 goals President Cabrera has. A couple of main directions which were included in his beginning of the year message. Separation of expanding axis of students and increasing academic excellence – to achieve both is a huge challenge, quite unique and ambitious. Provost Wu began his academic career 30 years ago. As Provost, his #1 goal is to strengthen our academic core – it needs reinforcement. Faculty is our core. Compared to our peers, core is not as strong as it needs to be. Disproportionate number of term, adjunct faculty – not all bad. We are taking advantage of who lives in the DC Metro area. Adjunct faculty per se are not the problem but we need to make it a priority of expanding the academic core. We have had a period of many new buildings and growth. A lot of funding went into growth and now we have the liability to pay back loans. Everything we do is leveraging from that core – that’s why we exist. Many other initiatives, priorities are really about how to take things we already have and scale/organize them in a way easier for students to access. Diversity and
inclusion are extremely important, given our diverse student body. Half are either minority or first generation students. They demand faculty populations reflecting this diversity for role models – not to establish quotas, but to recognize this important issue. While we’re strengthening our core, we will continue to build intellectual capacities through research and scholarship.

Senator: There have been recent problems with Metro; students contemplate not taking evening courses in Fairfax, especially in masters programs. Are there any plans to expand classes in Arlington?

Provost Wu: We are looking at how to make Arlington campus increasingly important. For example, how to make the department store building a more useful asset. Housing options are not plentiful in Arlington. How do we create accessible housing there for students?

Students expect multiple modes of education to be available to them, so we need to offer different modes of instruction. Different universities are putting programs online creating more access. Working on partnership with Wiley, an online provider. Wiley operates Johns Hopkins online as it does for other DC universities. Important to reach this population. Not to do this entirely, but to have option to do this. See Attachment A for Provost Wu’s 2016-17 Goals.

Chair Renshaw reminded Faculty Senators about the reception tonight at Mathy House (5:30-7:30 p.m.). Feel free to immerse yourself in conversation, etc.

Brief Budget Update: Chair Renshaw provided the following update from Senior Vice President J.J. Davis. In context of pay raise issue, trying to work on various legal options. The BOV will meet next week (October 13, 2016). Hopefully we will have an update after the BOV meeting.

IV. Committee Reports
A. Senate Standing Committees
   Executive Committee – Keith Renshaw, Chair
   The Executive Committee continues to work on issues. Our next meeting is October 21. Please email me with any issues you wish to bring (krenshaw@gmu.edu).

   Academic Policies – Suzanne Slayden, Chair
   We are working on a posthumous degree policy. We are waiting for the Registrar to submit the summer calendar for Faculty Senate approval.

   Budget and Resources – Tim Leslie, Chair
   We are looking at all the ways that money moves between the University and the Foundation, and hoping to get some engagement from senior administration to ask about how the Foundation has spent its money.

   Faculty Matters – Alan Abramson, Chair
   The committee has not met.

   Nominations – Mark Addleson, Chair
   We sent out a call for nominations and had to struggle with large number of nominees for Admissions Committee positions. As the Admissions Committee charge has no particular limit (5-7 member limit on university committee membership), we decided to add two members to the committee. Some departments are dealing with specific admissions matters. The following nominations were presented:
University Admissions Committee:
Estela Blaisten-Barojas, Computational and Data Sciences, COS
Marie Kodadek, School of Nursing, CHHS
Qiliang Li, Electrical and Computer Engineering, VSE

University Effective Teaching Committee:
Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Communication, CHSS (Faculty Senator)

University Faculty Salary Equity Committee:
KuoChu Chang, Systems Engineering and Research, VSE

No further nominations were made from the floor. Nominations were closed and the new committee members elected. Thanks to volunteers and to the committee for its work.

Organization and Operations- Lisa Billingham, Chair
We are working on three committee charges, with one to bring forward today. We discussed this also with other Faculty Senators; important to make sure a combination of members from various schools included. Goal is to form a committee to go out and find information about it, to investigate.

Resolution Calling for the Creation of a Committee to Develop a Conflict of Interest Policy that Addresses Institutional COIs that may Arise from Private Donations, Ownership in Licensed Intellectual Property, or Other Circumstances

Background
GMU currently has an Office of Research Integrity and Assurance (ORIA) which “promotes ethical and responsible conduct of research” and “provides policies, procedures, support, training and advice to aid researchers with compliance related to federal, state, university, and local regulations,” “identifies compliance risk,” and “monitors and investigates instances of noncompliance.”¹ This office, along with other offices on campus, administers the University’s Conflict of Interest policies for employees.

However, the University does not currently have a policy that addresses potential institutional conflicts of interest that may arise due to gifts to the University from private donors, ownership in licensed intellectual property, or other circumstances. Given that these scenarios are increasing in frequency, it is important that the University now create such a policy to ensure that it carefully oversees its intangible assets such as its intellectual prestige, integrity in teaching and research, and reputation of service to the public good.

Faculty members have the primary responsibility for preserving the integrity of their university’s teaching and research as well as its mission to serve the greater good;² and the GMU Faculty Senate has the “fundamental general responsibility to speak and act for the General Faculty on matters affecting the University as a whole” as well as the
“particular responsibility to formulate proposals on matters affecting the welfare of the University and on university-wide academic policy.”

Therefore, be it resolved that

1) The Faculty Senate and the Administration collaborate to develop a detailed policy for dealing with conflicts of interest arising from private donations, ownership in licensed intellectual property, and other relevant circumstances;

2) The committee consist of three to five faculty from at least three different schools/colleges (at least one of whom will be a Senator, and one of whom will serve as chair) elected by the Faculty Senate, as well as one or more administrators (as the Administration sees fit) appointed by the President or Provost — and to ensure faculty governance, elected faculty should compose the majority of the committee;

3) The resulting policy include instructions for how its provisions are to be implemented;

4) The resulting policy be consistent with AAUP guidelines (or, if not, the Committee’s report should explain why one or more of these guidelines are inappropriate);

5) The committee complete its work and provide a final report to the Senate no later than the Senate’s final scheduled meeting of the Spring 2017 semester.

1 http://oria.gmu.edu/

2 In order to preserve the integrity of higher education against undue extra-mural influence, the AAUP has repeatedly asserted, sometimes in concert with other educational associations, that the role of the faculty is key. For instance, a 1966 policy statement jointly formulated by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards, asserts faculty have the “primary responsibility” for ensuring the proper conduct of research activities (as quoted in Cary Nelson, Recommended Principles, AAUP Foundation/Univ of Illinois Pr, 2014, p.26). The AAUP also emphasizes that shared governance and academic freedom are “inextricably linked.” Accordingly, it cautions that the “relationship between industry and institutions of higher education in funding faculty research” poses a threat to “not only academic freedom and integrity but also the faculty role in institutional governance” (RP, 26). Warning that the “credibility and integrity of our nation’s universities are now at stake,” the AAUP “urges universities–and especially faculty senates” to “review, update, and strengthen their written policies and guidelines for structuring and managing academy-industry alliances and other sponsored research agreements on their campuses” (RP, 34). It is “entirely appropriate,” the AAUP states, “that faculty play the leading role in formulating standards” (RP, 26).

3 http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/

Discussion:

A Senator offered an amendment to 1) to add a representative from the Foundation (George Mason University Foundation).
Discussion included support for participation of the Foundation, an independent entity from the administration. As a separate entity in terms of dealing with COI, the Foundation should be included as a party. We cannot compel the administration to participate. One Senator expressed concern about administrative implementation of recommendations proposed by committees in the past.

The amendment was further clarified **(in bold)**. A resolution was made and seconded to approve the amendment.

1) The Faculty Senate and the Administration **will collaborate, and to the extent feasible, consult with the Foundation**, to develop a detailed policy for dealing with conflicts of interest arising from private donations, ownership in licensed intellectual property, and other relevant circumstances;

The amendment was approved.

The resolution as amended was approved.

**B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives** - no reports.

**V. New Business**

Honor Code & System Changes - LaShonda Anthony, Director of Office of Academic Integrity; and Senator Catherine Sausville presented a Summary of Changes to the Honor Code – see [Link to Slides](#). Statistics for 2015-16 are included in a Quick Facts Summary – [Attachment B](#). Updated for this month, the number of In Queue - student has met with office and is awaiting a hearing has decreased from 35 to 7 student cases and the number of In Progress – student has not scheduled an appointment has decreased from 33 to 5 student cases at this point.

Questions:
Senator: Is there a change in composition of students/faculty on Honor Committee?
Honor Committee members went from 5 to 4 to 3 – decisions usually unanimous, don’t need as many people.
Senator: Are you doing anything to encourage committee members to show up?
Director Anthony: Because they don’t have to meet as often, better response rate. They used to have to come in every week, etc. Usually ask attendance every other week; with more expedited reviews, there are fewer cases.

In response to a question about the Honor Guard program, proctoring request form sent to Honor Committee to see who is available; to provide additional pair of eyes in larger courses.

A Senator noted there is a long and bloody history with this system and thanked them for implementing these changes.
VI. **Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty**

The Technology Policy Committee meets next week. The Academic Appeals Committee will hold a meeting in the back of the room. A student is looking to discuss opposition to merit raises with a faculty member who supports this position. If you know of someone, please contact Chair Renshaw so we can relay contact to the student. The GMU Chapter of the AAUP will have a speaker from national (organization) at its meeting tomorrow at 4:00 p.m. See Dave Kuebrich for additional information.

VII. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Charlene Douglas
Secretary
Attachment A

Provost’s 2016-17 Goals

Rev. 8/23/2016

1. Build Resources
   a. Research funding
      • Increase sponsored research expenditures by 5%
      • Increase number of proposals submitted, value of awards, and postdoctoral fellows supported by 10%
      • Submit at least one proposal to VRIC, Go-Virginia (assuming programs are funded and accepting proposals) and a private partner
   b. Financial performance
      • Meet enrollment targets in F17 budget
      • Increase executive and professional education revenues by 20%

2. Strengthen Organization and Programs
   a. Transformative learning
      • Increase student participation in transformative learning (research and discovery, global engagement, entrepreneurship, social impact & innovation)
      • Increase study abroad participation by 15% and international student enrollments by 20%
      • Complete Year-One of the recommendations from the Student Experience project (re-engineering of key processes)
   b. Access
      • Develop collaborative plan with NOVA for transfer best-practice
      • Study and propose changes to tuition and fee structure to balance resource needs with access and retention objectives in collaboration with Finance
   c. Research
      • Complete strategic plan for research with concomitant metrics and milestones by January 1 and begin implementation of plan
   d. Wellbeing and diversity
      • Execute recommendations from diversity and inclusion plan, including: cultural competency training, campus climate assessment, search committee training, implement waiver process for targeted faculty opportunity hires in collaboration with HR and CDE
      • Show improvement in key satisfaction metrics for instructional/research faculty in collaboration with HR
e. Administrative and financial improvements

- Complete roll out of new budget model for Educational and General funds; design new budget model for F&A and multi-disciplinary programs in collaboration with Finance
- Deliver enrollment management improvements: Integrated information system, improved enrollment/financial projection data in collaboration with ITS and HR
- Roll out strategic plan metrics at the July summer planning conference; track throughout FY17 and prepare year-end report; align deans metrics

3. Strategic Initiatives

a. Digital Innovation:

- Bring at least three new online graduate programs to market
- Develop Virginia degree completion plan in collaboration with SCHEV and ODU and advance partnership with NOVA

b. Research and entrepreneurship:

- Institute of Biomedical Innovation (IBI): recruit director, identify new faculty recruits, complete lab fit-out, complete collaborative VRIC proposal with INOVA
- Cybersecurity/Information Technology: Build multidisciplinary coalitions and research capacity toward the establishment of a multidisciplinary institute
- Open MIX@Fenwick: collaborative space to support cross-disciplinary entrepreneurial activity of students, faculty, alumni and the community
- Launch Entrepreneurship@Mason: university-wide program to identify and advance entrepreneurial talent and support the creation and commercialization of intellectual property
Quick Fact Sheet

2015-2016 By the Numbers

Total Number of cases: 416
Total Number of Students Referred: 563
Total Number of Repeat Students: 24

Student Referrals (Note students may be referred for more than one violation)

- Students Referred for Cheating: 342
- Students Referred for Plagiarism: 238
- Students Referred for Lying: 33
- Students Referred for Stealing: 14

Case Resolution Options Used during 2015-2016 (student directed)

- Prehearing Resolution-Student accepts responsibility and sanction (306 student cases)
- Expedited Review-in paper review by committee (100 student cases)
- Sanctions Only Hearing-In person review of sanctions with admission of responsibility (17 student cases)
- Full Hearing-In person review of case-all parties appear (72 student cases)
- In Queue-student has met with office and is awaiting a hearing (35 student cases)
- In Progress- student has not scheduled an appointment (33 student cases)