I. Call to Order: Chair Keith Renshaw called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.
II. Approval of the Minutes of February 1, 2017 as amended: The minutes of February 1, 2017 as amended were approved. The minutes of the March 1, 2017 will be presented for approval at our next meeting (April 26, 2017).

III. Announcements

President Cabrera thanked the faculty for everyone you do. To highlight a few things which have been happening:

- We are one of three finalist schools competing for a major award from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). We received an intense site visit. I couldn’t have been more proud of the resources that were available; they highlighted the strength of our university brand. Forty million ($40M) over several years between COS, VSE, SCHAR, and CHSS. We provide better when we join across disciplines and focused on intense issues. Whether we receive it or not, this highlights how highly competitive we can be when we bring resources together across the university.

- We are in the next stage in partnership with NVCC to assist students as they transfer from a two-year program and earn a four-year undergraduate degree. Governor McAuliffe, the head of SCHEV and prominent leaders in the business community attended a media event. It is the largest partnership of its kind. What a privilege to be at a university where we are competing with two top level universities for a high level award, and working on new partnerships to help students fulfill their dream of a four year degree. What other institution can do these two things at once? The President was very proud of our progress on both fronts. And thanks you for all you do. About 80% of students entering community college aspire to a four-year degree; only 14% achieve this goal. Our numbers are a little better – 20% achieve this goal. We are all looking forward to seeing this new partnership unfold.

- A whole new batch of rankings are out, looking at different areas of excellence – every year we do a little bit better. This is our first time in the top 50% of public universities in the US. US News and World Report also highlights specific departments.

- The fundraising side is also doing very, very well. Pretty much every big gift raised can be traced to the work of a faculty member. We have had record years since I arrived and pushed the goal higher. As of last week, we have now achieved our $500M goal set for our campaign – a really big deal. We’re not going to stop there – original deadline was December 2018. Although we have not agreed to a new goal, we will keep going and push our goal higher. It is very satisfying to have conversations with folks in the community and not have to spend so much time on why it is so important to give to Mason. The First Mason Giving Day takes place tomorrow (April 6, 2017). Try to be part of the movement, keep posting on social media.

- Some good news. The budget has not yet been signed by the governor, but there are indications that the budget will incorporate 3% raise for classified staff, 2% raise for faculty with authorization to offer 3%. We do not want to celebrate prematurely because of what happened last year; we celebrated our success on the budget but then the government took our non-raise raise away from us. So, we had to do some repair work with the General Assembly though they understood why we proceeded as we did. Virginia pays about half of these raises. I have told J.J. et al to make sure 3% raise across the board. J.J. is working on that and will find a solution to that. Budget has to be signed in the next few days. Then the BOV has to vote on budget in May. If all goes through, our average salaries will have gone up 10% since I arrived at Mason. We still have lots to do – salaries still a vulnerability to the
human. Human Resources is looking beyond just pay; for example, they are exploring measures to expand disability insurance to everybody.

- Great progress on several academic fronts including emphasis on Student Experience Redesign Project – how to better manage a whole host of services for students to succeed and to be more involved. Bethany Usher is the new Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. One of her tasks is to figure out what made the Mason undergraduate experience outstanding. One initiative was Mason Impact (competition among undergraduates). There is also a new open space for entrepreneurial innovation at Fenwick Library; it is available to everyone, and is a very iconic central space. The space will eventually move into Robinson Hall once completed. When Richmond approved funding for the renovation of Robinson Hall, there had to be a demonstrated connection to job creation so we added this space for entrepreneurship and innovation; this was critical to the funding’s approval. The President has seen some early designs for the new Robinson Hall. Peterson Hall will house a lot of our innovative programs – on time and on budget.

- Enrollment is strong; there were a few soft years in part due to graduate program changes in processing graduate applications. This new process is now working, so the numbers are finally turning around and overall going well. Undergraduate applications are doing very well. The old system provided a great ratio of not so strong applications. We switched to nothing, and then to the Common Application. We should see some increases in application numbers and improvements in the undergraduate population, particularly out-of-state. We are receiving more and better and more diverse students. We have enjoyed more recognition of our academic work and our leadership in inclusion and access; we have an exceptional team here at Mason. Increasing academic excellence, building research, access and inclusion, in a time of restrained funding requires a lot of hard work and creativity. Thanks to all our colleagues who made that happen.

Questions/Discussion

Senator: How do we help students already here?
President Cabrera: We have by far the largest number of transfer students in Virginia; more than 25% of our student body. We are one of the leaders in US in taking transfer students. Even with all that work, many don’t get 4 year degrees because their credits don’t add up. This new partnership will make it easier and less costly to earn a four-year degree, thus allowing us to deliver on our mission. We do need to push our tuition up, given the ongoing disinvestment in Virginia.

Senator: How much is our endowment? How much did it increase?
President Cabrera: Percentage increase bigger when you start with tiny endowment. We have gone from $50M to almost $80M. For a university of our size, we virtually have nothing (a very small endowment) to pass on to next generation of folks. Donors don’t want to provide endowment dollars. The largest gifts are to be spent over 5, 6, or 7 years.

Follow up: Of the $500M, how much is in pocket? In promise?
President Cabrera: A combination of pledges, some are estate gifts, money to be spent for specific purpose. Varies so greatly, most of it goes to scholarships, professor endowed chairs, for facilities (Peterson building) and a new series of faculty awards – medals at Commencement will be endowed.
We’re doing a fundraising event in May for scholarships for dreamers; the Capital Campaign covers a wide variety of purposes.

Senator: Has GMU started to figure out the potential of federal budget cuts affecting us? Such as NIH, among other agencies?
President Cabrera: I share your concerns. We just did the rounds on Capitol Hill in March. My only hope is they won’t agree on what to cut if they cannot agree to help. Cuts’ impact felt throughout the country. There will be cuts without a doubt, when you talk to folks in sciences, even state department cuts such as Ministry of Cultural Affairs. We don’t know what the cuts will be. He thanked several members of the Budget and Resources Committee are involved with better aligning our budget systems with our needs.

In response to a question from an earlier meeting, President Cabrera does not have data on cuts to the University administration as promised; information will be provided.

Senator: Concerned about cuts to education and the National Endowment for the Humanities impact on our campuses, along with a reduction in taxes and the administrative state.
President Cabrera: On any policy issue which matters to us, there are faculty on each side of issue – as there should be – that’s what we do as academics. As President, he tries to keep our business going and healthy. Will defend it, will go anywhere to go raise money, even to those who want cuts. If it’s good quality academic work, we want it on this campus.

Provost Wu: Has asked Vice President Michelle Marks to give a presentation on the Wiley initiative, hopefully to give you a more complete picture (after last meeting’s discussion). For a couple of years now, seed grant programs have been awarded to foster collaborative work across campus. Our new VP of Research has continued this effort. We are adding a new program to focus on collaboration on Curriculum Impact as a precursor for seed grant for education programs. Both resources and education should be two sides of the same coin. Michelle Marks did an Information session last week – these programs are not a wholesale agreement, but a guided pathway. Cited example of Mechanical Engineering and HAP graduate programs. To do about five programs per year, faculty of programs heavily involved and some are in this room. Program by program, faculty would have active involvement. It is important to provide guidance to students to make the pipeline as strong as possible. Students will be better prepared and coordinated.
Questions/discussion
Senator: What about INTO?
Provost Wu: INTO is performing better than we initially perceived – ahead of schedule; achieved enrollment goals sooner than expected. Given current climate in administration, there are warning signs in terms of overall drop in international education in US. INTO is concerned about this and have told us about it. Applications to Canadian universities are up 20%. To this point doing we are doing well, but we hope that worrisome clouds will not materialize.

Sr. Vice President JJ Davis: We’re preparing for our session with the BOV. She thanked Budget and Resources for their work.
IV. Committee Reports

A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee- Keith Renshaw, Chair
Our final meeting is next Monday, April 10th. He reminded Senators to send items for consideration by Friday.

Academic Policies – no report

Budget and Resources- no report

Faculty Matters – Alan Abramson, Chair
The Faculty Evaluation of Administrators is in your inbox – please fill it out. The response rate is a little low (20%), hoping to reach 40%. He encouraged Senators to fill it out, and to encourage your colleagues to do it. He apologized for the glitch when it first opened. If you have having problems with the survey, please let me know.

Nominations – Mark, Addleson, Chair
Ginny Blair (CHHS) is nominated to serve on the Academic Integrity Advisory Committee for AY 2017-18. No further nominations were made from the floor, and her nomination was approved. The response to the call for nominations to serve as Faculty Representatives to the BOV Committees was less than sturdy. We are still looking for nominees willing to serve. Alan Abramson and Keith Renshaw have both served on the Development Committee - an interesting experience and not a lot of work. Please see me after the meeting if you are interested. We distributed a call for nominees to serve on two committees for the Office of Graduate Education about a week ago, so far there has been silence – please think about this opportunity to serve.

Organization and Operations – Lisa Billingham, Chair
The letters to the deans informing them of the allotment of Senate seats for next year have been distributed.

B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

Annual Faculty Senate Evaluation of the President and Provost: The committees’ responses were distributed with the agenda (see Attachment A). There are variations across the university. Chair Renshaw will reach out to follow up with committees.

V. New Business

Wiley contract: Michelle Marks, Vice President for Academic Innovation and New Ventures

Chair Renshaw welcomed Vice President Michelle Marks. The Faculty Senate collected about forty questions from faculty in an effort to facilitate clarification of questions on the Wiley contract. In separating them out, there were a lot of questions about how to align the 8 week course calendar with our academic calendar. The Faculty Senate is NOT voting on changes or issues this year.
A Senator asked whether it is correct that the Faculty Senate has to vote to approve any changes to the academic calendar? Chair Renshaw replied “That is correct.”

Vice President Marks and her group put together a document, met with the Executive Committee, then received more input – you have the responses as they were distributed to you Link to Fact Sheet/FAQ. She will give a brief overview of the document and brought other colleagues to help with questions, including Renate Guilford (Associate Provost for Enrollment Management), and three faculty leaders now working with the program: P.J. Maddox (Professor and Chair, Health Administration and Policy, CHHS), Pam Baker (Director, Special Education & disAbility Research/Assoc Prof, College of Education and Human Development) and Paige Wolf (Assistant Dean Graduate Programs for the School of Business).

Vice President Marks thanked faculty for their questions and welcomes your feedback. Fifteen percent (15%) of students get their education entirely online. Among professional masters programs we face regional and national completion as more students are making choice to go online. We are a ground based institution; currently 3% of our courses are online. If we want to see enrollment in professional masters programs increase, we need to make them available online. Not insistence, but to find matches where it is appropriate. To get high quality programs online, we studied both partnership models and do-it-yourself models (large systems such as Pennsylvania and Arizona State) - we do not have the financial resources to do that. Many institutions have taken on a partner doing support functions such as IT, marketing, student support, and course design support. This helps faculty members who are not as well-versed in putting course information online. Some of you were involved in the RFP process (including former Senate chair Charlene Douglas and Senator Stanley Zoltek served on the RFP Advisory Committee). Wiley was selected as the partner (final Master Service Agreement was signed in September 2016). By the end of 2016 Wiley and the Provost’s office selected and contracted four master’s degree programs and three graduate certificate programs as the initial cohort of the Wiley partnership to be launched in 2018.

Professor P.J. Maddox, Chair, Department of Health Administration and Policy: My department considered Wiley as a faculty development incentive. John Cantiello (former Faculty Senator) represented our department in exploring online opportunities. Our department has been early adapters of online and hybrid courses. Evolving complexity of recruiting students: in our area recruitment is not just driven by the nature of the area, but also flexibility and demand for online programs. We looked at feasibility of all online options possible, at the same time the university was considering Wiley. A unique opportunity with Wiley, we can eat what we kill – our enrollment has increased but our department has not received an increase in faculty. So we’re especially excited about this. Faculty involved in planning academic, harmonization and life issues – we will offer two online degrees: Master of Health Administration and Master of Science in Health Informatics and a graduate certificate in
Health Information and Analytics. We will admit students soon to begin matriculation in August 2018.

Professor Pam Baker, Division Director, Special Education, CEHD: We will offer a Master of Special Education and two certificate programs: Certificate in Autism (Education) and Certificate in Applied Behavioral Analysis (Education). We came into this as a faculty driven initiative. We had already done some on our own, reached a ceiling, hit hard. Three areas identified: reaching beyond our level, student access – to better support faculty pedagogical expertise. What Wiley offered: tailored boxes for services – nationally and also content – never able to get into that. Wiley can help us to standardize orientation modules. Faculty are excited to see what’s missing – e.g. case study, Wiley helping us to storyboard. We’re very optimistic, embraced idea and met within academic departments.

Paige Wolf, School of Business: We’ve been down this road before – Wiley appeals to us as marketing is critical to have a flourishing program that raises all our boats and generates money for research. Focus on quality at Wiley – international scope, help, active support etc. can be used for ground based students as well. MBA time to complete is important – Wiley is very competitive.

Questions/Discussion:
Would students come to campus to take tests? How do you guarantee identity?
Professor Maddox: We are in discussion with Wiley about this, possible to use tools such as biometrics. Our programs involve greater real time interaction between students and individual recognition participation – develop relationships with students. Ours are competency based programs, not just integrity work, but first form relationships – will get back to you on that.

Follow UP: Is GMU responsible for maintaining infrastructure for software and hardware?

VP Marks: Responsibility for Students Information Systems using GMU Blackboard for LMS. Wiley provides support functions. We have to provide bridge data.
Follow Up: Concerned about supportive infrastructure as program grows bigger.

What is profit level for the unit? Wiley's cut is 43%.
VP Marks: The institution gets its share of revenue – 10% to university services, the rest to college. College working with programs to share revenue.

Renate Guilford: Wiley charged price based on what market will bear, each program will be charged differently. As described earlier, revenue to go to college, stays within the college. Modeling of estimates Wiley did over ten year, adding 3 courses per year; units determine faculty costs, some programming supports.

Senator: Faculty develop course and it is not owned by them?
Renate Guilford: Faculty are the subject matter experts; they will receive a stipend to develop the course, then course revenue goes to the program. Program decides to reinvest it.

PJ Maddox: Arrangement with Wiley not that different than arrangements we have now. Opportunity to decide as a workload or overload assignments. Assigned course development stipend does not exist now in areas faculty are familiar with. After Wiley gets its cut, revenue comes back to operating unit—to determine how to spend it.

Senator: We are not their only (client). How do you get them to be faithful to us, not to send students to another university?
VP Marks: Marketing teams focus on what is special to Mason—use sophisticated analytical techniques. A little freaky and scary to see what can be known, interviewing faculty to see what’s unique to our programs. If it’s not Wiley it will be another provider, such as Pearson.

Provost Wu: The marketing team for Mason is the marketing team for Mason.
Senator: Is this an open invitation to add courses on and hire adjuncts?
Provost Wu: We have accreditation to comply with, cannot have all adjunct faculty teaching. This is a big concern for us and also for the programs involved in the program.

Senator: If a student doesn’t have to come to Mason, they don’t have to come to the US?
Professor Maddox: In our programs we have to follow outcomes for five years. This requirement is part of our accreditation program already, does not diminish our responsibility.
Professor Baker added Education has (similar) accreditation requirements in place.
Senator: How do you establish a relationship between teachers and students online?
Professor Maddox invited him to come to see how their online programs work.
Chair Renshaw: If you have more questions, please email me or Meg and we will compile them.

VI. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty
University Service Awards were presented today, including an award for a faculty member for 50 years of service and Senator Suzanne Slayden received her forty (40) year pin.
Chair Renshaw apologized there was not enough time to the students scheduled to present today and will be rescheduled to our next meeting.
Linda Harber reminded faculty that Open Enrollment begins May 1- May 15th.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:19 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charlene Douglas
Secretary
Attachment A

Evaluation of the President and Provost by Faculty Senate Standing Committees, University Standing Committees, and Ad Hoc Committees AY 2016-17
Note that some committees did not provide responses to each question.

1. During the past calendar year has the President or Provost announced initiatives or goals or acted upon issues that fall under the charge of your Committee? If so, was your Committee consulted by the President or Provost in a timely manner before the announcement or action? If not, do you believe your Committee should have been consulted? Would it have been helpful to have had the input of your Committee from the outset?

Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

Academic Policies: The Provost's office is attempting to integrate the academic year calendars for the Wiley on-line courses and the regular academic year courses. The calendar that was given to the committee for AY 2020-2021 was accompanied by a message suggesting that the calendar was ready to be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval (the Faculty Senate approves the Academic Year calendars 3 years in advance). However, this was not the case and many errors were discovered in the calendar by the committee. Other questions about the calendar could not be immediately answered by the Provost's office. The Academic Policies committee expended a great deal of time and effort on this, and believes the calendar should have been checked more thoroughly before being given to the committee.

Faculty Matters: With regard to the Task Force on Term Faculty, the Provost and his office were responsive to the interest of the Faculty Matters Committee in being represented among task force members. This was accomplished by appointing a Faculty Matters Committee member to the task force.

Nominations: The response, essentially, is ‘no’. The Provost’s office establishes various committees and task forces. In recent months this office has created an Adjunct Faculty Committee and continues to guide the work of the Term Faculty Task Force. In this regard, from the standpoint of the Nominations Committee, the work of the Provost and his staff is entirely satisfactory. They have discussed with the Faculty Senate Executive the circumstances and/or terms and conditions of the committees and task forces for which they are responsible, asking for advice when necessary.

Responses from University Standing Committees:

Academic Appeals: Not applicable.

Adult Learning and Executive Education: No, no initiatives announced in the past calendar year fall under the charge of the Adult Learning and Executive Education Committee.

Athletic Council: No, there were no initiatives or goals that fell under the charge of this committee.

External Academic Relations: Don’t believe so.

Effective Teaching: No.
Grievance: No.

Faculty Handbook: No initiatives or goals fell under the charge of the committee.

Mason Core: The President and Provost have been promoting the Mason Impact, which has the potential to influence the Mason Core. Although we weren’t initially consulted, with the appointment of Bethany Usher to fill the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education role, and the chair of the Mason Core, we have been discussing how we can better align the two curricular initiatives.

Minority and Diversity Issues: The President and Provost have sent out eleven University Announcements related to Diversity and Inclusion in response to things happening on campus, nationally and internationally. The Committee was not consulted on any of them. Input from a Committee like ours could increase awareness and transparency in the University community.

University Promotion, Tenure, and Renewal Appeal (UPTRAC): N/A - No new actions last year that fall under the charge of UPTRAC.

2. Did your Committee seek information or input from the President or Provost or members of their staffs? If so, did they respond adequately and in a timely manner?

Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

Academic Policies: Yes, the committee did request more information. For the concerns expressed about changing the time of the Columbus Day holiday in the upcoming academic year calendars that have already been approved, there was no response. For the concern expressed about errors in the proposed 2020-2021 AY calendar, there was an immediate response. However, after that, there was no further communication by the Provost’s office to the committee.

Faculty Matters: In response to a request from the Faculty Matters Committee, the Provost submitted an activity report for faculty to consult in responding to the Faculty Evaluation of Administrators survey for 2016-17. The President’s office suggested we use the president’s updates to the BOV for his activity report.

Nominations: The committee asked for nominations of university staff to serve on committees. The responses were timely and the committee received the necessary information.

Responses from University Standing Committees:

Academic Appeals: The work of this committee occurs episodically and only after the Provost’s office has completed its review. So far this year, the committee has not sought information or input from the Provost’s office.

Adult Learning and Executive Education: At the start of AY 2016-2017, our Committee sought information from the Faculty Senate requesting clarification (more specifics) of the Committee charge. The response was timely and adequate.

Athletic Council: Yes and the response came promptly.
External Academic Relations: The office of governmental relations was prompt in responding to requests for information in preparation for higher education advocacy day. In addition, the vice president of governmental relations met with multiple members of the committee to help them prepare for this effort. Finally, other members of that office have been inclusive of our committee members in their reports and responsive to other requests for information and input.

Effective Teaching: Yes, OIRA/IRR has been collaborative and very supportive of our work.

Grievance: We provided two findings on cases before the committee. We received a response to one, many months after. We have never received a response to the other.

Faculty Handbook: The committee had extensive meetings with a representative from the Provost’s office regarding revisions to the Faculty Handbook. The Provost’s office has been accessible and responsive.

Mason Core: Because the Associate Provost is a key member of the committee, there is always close collaboration.

Minority and Diversity Issues: The Minority and Diversity Issues Committee met with Julian Williams of the Office of Compliance, Diversity and Ethics to discuss the issues, concerns and goals of the Office, and how the Committee might be of assistance or call on him for assistance. As a result, one Committee member has been included on the search committee for the new Director of Faculty Diversity Engagement.

The Committee also reached out and met with Rose Pascarell and Kahan Sablo from the Office of University Life as well as Eden King, the current University Presidential Fellow. The goal was to establish communication and offer our assistance with diversity and inclusion issues on campus.

University Promotion, Tenure, and Renewal Appeal (UPTRAC): Yes, the committee worked closely with the Provost office to get all the materials necessary for the UPTRAC deliberations. All the materials were provided to the committee in timely manner. In addition, the committee includes two tenured administrators and one alternate tenured administrator appointed by the Provost and the specific composition changes depending on the possible conflicts in a particular case. This situation plus the fact that the meetings happen in summer months makes scheduling a challenging process. The Provost office and the faculty senate clerk worked very hard to ensure that the meetings are scheduled appropriately and with all the members present.

3. Please suggest how you believe the President, Provost and/or their staffs might more effectively interact with your Committee in the future, if necessary.

Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

Academic Policies: The interaction would be more effective if calendars were correct before submission to the committee.

Faculty Matters: Fine as is.

Nominations: No need for improvement.

Responses from University Standing Committees:
**Academic Appeals:** So far this year, the committee has no record of interactions with the Provost’s office and therefore has no suggestions.

**Adult Learning and Executive Education:** It would be helpful to know what leadership intends to do with any findings generated by the Committee, in order to conduct more efficient and effective information searches.

**Athletic Council:** We have very good interaction with the President and Provost office as staff members of these offices attend the Committee and sub-committees meetings.

**External Academic Relations:** No suggestions at this time.

**Grievance:** They could respond to our findings and let us know what actions they have taken on the cases.

**Faculty Handbook:** No suggestions.

**Mason Core:** Not needed.

**Minority and Diversity Issues:** Maintaining open lines of communication is the best way to interact with the Committee. The Committee is reaching out to offer consultation on diversity and inclusion issues. Many events are occurring around campus that we are not aware of. If we were invited to participate in planning or to attend, we could get more involved, provide support and help advertise the events.

**University Promotion, Tenure, and Renewal Appeal (UPTRAC):** The UPTRAC is currently completing the development of guidelines that will help all parties to interact in a more efficient and better formalized manner. Also, the respective chapter of the Faculty Handbook was revised during the last year. The Faculty Handbook Committee did a great job on these revisions.

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

**Responses from Faculty Senate Standing Committees:**

**Academic Policies:** The committee discovered that the Summer Term Calendar for 2016, as posted on the Registrar’s website, was changed by the addition of a new session, **without notification to or approval of the Faculty Senate**. It is the responsibility of the Academic Policies Committee to recommend the academic year and summer term calendars to the Faculty Senate for approval.

**Faculty Matters:** Nothing to add.

**Nominations:** Nothing further to add.

**Responses from University Standing Committees:**

**Academic Appeals:** Not applicable.

**Adult Learning and Executive Education:** Nothing further to add.

**Athletic Council:** As indicated above, the interaction is excellent.

**Effective Teaching:** Very supportive so far.
Faculty Handbook: The Provost and his representative were extremely helpful in proposing revisions to the Faculty Handbook.

Minority and Diversity Issues: The Committee has drafted and sent a Memo to the President's Diversity and Inclusion Leadership Council requesting information about their goals, progress made to date and how we can be of assistance to them.

University Promotion, Tenure, and Renewal Appeal (UPTRAC): The UPTRAC expresses deep gratitude to Meg Caniano for her extraordinary efforts in scheduling and organizing UPTRAC meetings and taking meeting notes.