I. Call to Order: Chair Melissa Broeckelman-Post called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

II. Opening Remarks – Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Chair
   • Chair Broeckelman-Post made opening announcements:
     o Welcome reception for new ombudsperson at JC Bistro on Mar 3 9:00-10:30 am.
     o Please watch video recording of forum for the Task Force on Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards and then complete survey (due March 11).
     o Executive Committee has a Zoom coffee chat on Fri from 9:30 – 10 a.m.
   • Chair Broeckelman-Post reminded Senators of elements of Robert’s Rules before moving to unfinished business.

III. Unfinished Business

Revised Charge for the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee
   • Lisa Billingham, Chair of Organization and Operations Committee, summarized the updated changes that had been made to the originally proposed revisions to the charge: (1) to specify one of the three faculty members as a term faculty member; (2) to specify that administrative representatives are non-voting; and (3) allowing 3 weeks between first reading of proposed revisions and final vote (see Appendix A for the original charge and preface wording, the proposed revisions with track changes highlighting the changes to the revisions, and a clean copy of the proposed revisions under debate).

   • Senator Tim Gibson offered two amendments to the proposed revisions (which were subsequently seconded), along with a rationale for each:
     o In the second paragraph under Charge: change “at least 3 weeks” to “at least 8 weeks” which would give Faculty Senate more time to deliberate proposed revisions. This will allow for a 2nd Senate meeting between the original presentation and the final vote.
     o In the fourth paragraph under Charge: delete “Provost and President.” The President and Provost currently do not approve the Faculty Handbook – only the Faculty Senate and Board of Visitors do. Without this amendment, the proposed revisions would put the president and provost “between” the Faculty Senate and the Board of Visitors.

   • Senator Trencher noted that, in remarks at the last meeting, she had not intended to attack or insult individuals by using names – she was simply expressing disagreement. She offered apologies if anything she said had been taken as an insult.

   • Senator Slayden (Chair, Faculty Handbook Revision Committee) spoke on both motions:
     o She expressed that it was not necessary to have 2 months between the original presentation of changes and final vote. In the past, 3 weeks has provided ample time for addressing any suggested changes. If, for some reason, an issue could not be resolved within 3 weeks, the revisions affected by that issue could simply not be presented in the final vote that year. Also, the schedule has been to have revisions effective in the Handbook as of July 1 (beginning of the fiscal year), with the BOV giving approval at the
last meeting of the academic year in May. It would be difficult to keep that schedule with 8 weeks between presentations.

- With regard to striking Provost and President, Senator Slayden noted that the Handbook addresses the rights and responsibility of both faculty and administration in things like faculty employment (e.g., recruitment, hiring, promotion and tenure, and working in shared governance within their local academic units, colleges and the university). The final step in most faculty processes involves approval of the provost and/or president. Thus, those individuals need to agree to these things that are specified. Further, the BOV will ask the provost and president for their input on changes.

  - Senator Jabbari stated that perhaps there could be a lower and upper boundary of time, such as “at least three weeks and no more than 8 weeks.” He also expressed his perception that the administration has increasingly tried to follow the Handbook over time and his concern that removing “provost and president” could lead them to have less regard for the Handbook.

  - Senator Letiecq noted that, in the past, she has felt rushed at times in making decisions, and agrees that more time is needed for Senators to digest information and engage in discussion and debate. With regard to striking “provost and president” from paragraph 4, she noted that there is already a lot stated in the charge about engaging the president and provost in deliberations, so having president and provost specified in the final clause does not seem necessary, and could build into the Handbook a further erosion of faculty power.

  - Senator Simmons (current member of the Faculty Handbook Committee) proposed an amendment to Senator Gibson’s amendment to change “not greater than 8 weeks” to “not greater than 5 weeks.” The amendment to the amendment was seconded. Senator Simmons continued by noting that he was not concerned about removing “Provost and President” from the fourth paragraph, because they are implicitly involved throughout the process, and it would be unproductive and nonsensical for the committee to go directly against the Provost in recommendations.

    - Senators Venigalla and Gibson voiced general support for Senator Simmons’ amendment related to timing.

    - Senator Renshaw noted that an alternative to increasing the time between first presentation and final vote would be to receive a broader overview of changes under discussion by the committee (without final wording) earlier in the year. He indicated his main concern about 5 weeks would be if it made it difficult to have revisions to the BOV for vote in May.

    - Senator Blair voiced agreement with 5 weeks, as well as with the prospect of an earlier overview from the committee. She also noted that perhaps the timeline could be 3-5 weeks, so that it was not necessary to wait the entire 5 weeks if it was not needed.

    - Senator Slayden noted that it takes a long time to get the wording finalized, so a longer timeline would most likely result in the committee bringing wording that had not been fully finalized to the Senate for discussion, which could be inefficient. A broader overview of changes earlier, without actual wording, might be worthwhile.

    - Senator Monea voiced agreement for the change to 5 weeks. He noted that it takes time to receive input from faculty in his department. He also noted that the wording itself is critically important, so having ample time review final wording is critical.

    - Senator Letiecq voiced support for the 5-week amendment, noting the importance of having as many faculty able to provide input as possible.

    - Chair Broeckelman-Post noted no more hands raised, and called for a vote on Senator Simmons’ amendment to Senator Gibson’s amendment. The amendment was approved, such that the amendment now under debate was to change “3 weeks” to “5 weeks.”

  - There was some discussion about whether the wording should be “at least” 5 weeks, or “up to” 5 weeks (i.e., could the decision be made more quickly if all agreed?). It was clarified
that “at least 5 weeks” meant that no vote could be held until 5 weeks from the original presentation (the same interpretation would hold for “at least 3 weeks”).

- Senator Abramson moved to close debate on the amendment to change “3 weeks” to “5 weeks.” The motion was seconded and subsequently approved. The amendment to change “3 weeks” to “5 weeks” was then voted on and approved.

- Senator Slayden spoke in regard to the remaining amendment, to delete “Provost and President” from paragraph 4. She noted that this wording came in conjunction with deleting part of the originally proposed revision that had stated that revisions would be approved by the Provost before being presented to Faculty Senate. She stated that the original wording had been intended to assure Senators that the Provost would not object to the changes being discussed, but some thought that wording sounded like a requirement for the provost to pre-approve the wording. This new wording was derived to fit better with the overall intent. To completely remove them seemed akin to disininviting them from the table; thus, she opposed this amendment.

- Senator Jabbari made an amendment to Senator Gibson’s amendment, from removing “provost and president” to removing only “and president,” because the provost would be sufficient. The amendment was not seconded.

- Senator Venigalla noted that, based on his own experiences, he believed the provost and president should not be cut out from this process.

- Senator Letiecq stated that striking the “provost and president” from that line does not cut them out from deliberation and discussion. It simply allows the Faculty Senate to assert what they want, even if the provost and president disagree. Having them in the process at that point feels like a way to silence the faculty. Removing them from that paragraph is not the same as cutting them out, as they are mentioned in the charge quite a bit.

- Senator Monea echoed that, even if they are removed from that sentence, there are still numerous points of contact throughout the process (e.g., non-voting administrators as members of the committee). The amendment only allows for a change that is approved by the Faculty Senate but not by the provost and president to be passed directly to the Board of Visitors. He stated that this possibility would be very rare, but is important to maintain.

- Senator Renshaw agreed with the importance of preserving the capacity for faculty to speak directly to the BOV, but asserted that the best venue for that is through the FS Chair (a representative to the BOV), not through the Faculty Handbook Revisions Committee. The Faculty Handbook has specific issues in it (e.g., tenure, promotion) that faculty have primacy for, but not unilateral control of. There are also other components in the Handbook that deal with the structure of the university. At its core, it represents a shared governance document – so the administration should be involved.

- Senator Gibson expressed that the Faculty Handbook is the primary document that governs our work lives as faculty; thus, it is where faculty power should be at its greatest. The President and Provost are included in other areas of the charge. This amendment simply means that FS can speak directly to the BOV about the Handbook, without having to go through the filter of the president and provost.

- Senator Schrag noted that, in the preface of the current Handbook, President and Provost only have input on revisions, not the chance to approve or veto them. The proposed charge revisions would give that to them – this amendment simply maintains the status quo.

- Senator Trencher noted that removing President and Provost could allow the FS to support them in a situation where the BOV was less supportive of the university and its mission. That is not the case now, but has been at other universities and could be here in the future.

- Senator Simmons expressed that this amendment was likely not as impactful as it might seem. It would be unusual for the committee to disregard the input of the Provost and President, even if they are removed from this specific sentence in this specific paragraph.
• A motion was made to close debate. The motion was seconded and subsequently passed.
• A vote was then held on the amendment to delete the words “provost and president” from paragraph 4 of the charge. The motion passed.
• There was no further discussion on the overall motion to revise the charge (with the two amendments). A vote was held, and the motion passed. The final, approved charge is shown in Appendix B.

IV. Committee Reports

A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee – Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Chair
• The next Senate Coffee Chat will be held Friday, March 4 at 9:30am on Zoom

Academic Policies – Suzanne Slayden, Chair
• No report.

Budget and Resources – Melissa Broeckelman-Post on behalf of Kumar Mehta, Chair
• The new faculty salary data are available.

Faculty Matters – Solon Simmons, Chair
• Chair Simmons recognized Committee member Senator Letiecq, who had asked the Faculty Matters Committee to consider supporting a joint resolution with the GMU Chapter of the AAUP rejecting efforts to restrict education about racism, addressing Governor’s Executive Order Number One that prohibits PreK-12 educators from discussing critical race theory. The resolution is intended to support educators in VA in rejecting efforts to restrict education about racism, and asserts our academic freedom here at Mason. She asked Senators to read the resolution and consider in advance of a hopeful vote soon.

Nominations – Richard Craig, Chair
• No report.

Organization and Operations – Lisa Billingham, Chair
• There are no changes in allocation of Faculty Senate seats to colleges/schools for the 2022-2023 academic year (see Appendix C). Emails to Deans are forthcoming.

B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

• Athletic Council submitted a report – no questions were raised.
• Graduate Council submitted a report – no questions were raised.
• Grievance Committee submitted a report – no questions were raised.
• The Technology Policy Committee submitted a report. Co-chair Daigle also spoke about a proposed draft charge for a limited term Faculty Senate Task Force to revisit governance committees related to IT management issues. They hope to bring a proposed charge to the March 23 Senate meeting.

V. New Business

• Senator Simmons encouraged faculty to fill out the COACHE survey, and encourage others to do so. The COACHE survey facilitates evidence-based organizational change. A high response rates is crucial for success. The Gallup faculty and staff experience survey (a separate survey) will begin April 18 – it includes both faculty and staff, and allows Mason to compare its work environment to broader entities outside of higher education.
VI. Announcements

- A reminder about registration for an event (*Clint Smith: How the Word is Passed: A Reckoning with the History of Slavery Across America*) was included in the agenda (see Appendix E).

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

Respectfully submitted,
Keith Renshaw
Secretary
Appendix A
Revised Charge of the Faculty Handbook Revisions Committee

Feb., 17, 2022

Original charge to the committee

Faculty Handbook Revision Committee (Approved by the Faculty Senate April 28, 2010)

The Organization and Operations Committee moves that the Faculty Senate establish a Faculty Handbook Revision Committee consisting of three tenured members of the instructional faculty, at least one of whom must be a Senator, to consider changes to the Faculty Handbook and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

Proposed changes may be brought to the Committee by any member of the faculty, administration, or Visitor. The Committee is charged to confer with appropriate members of the administration during consideration of any change.

In order to maintain continuity, members of this Committee shall have staggered terms of one, two, and three years.

From the Preface to the Faculty Handbook (2021)

...Proposals to revise the Handbook will be considered by the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee (a University Standing Committee composed of three faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate) which meets jointly with representatives from Human Resources and Payroll and the Provost’s office. The proposed revisions that are approved by that body will be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval.

All revisions require the formal approval of the Board of Visitors….

Proposed revision of the charge of the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee (with track changes)

Committee Membership:

• Three members of the instructional faculty elected by the Faculty Senate to 3-year terms. Two faculty must be tenured and one faculty must be a term faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or higher. At least one member must be a Senator. At least two members must be tenured. In order to maintain continuity, the faculty members of the Committee shall have staggered terms. The Chair of the committee is appointed by and from among the elected faculty members;

• An A non-voting administrative representative appointed by the Provost from the Provost’s office;

• An A non-voting administrative representative from Human Resources appointed by the Vice President of Human Resources.

Charge:
The Committee will review the Faculty Handbook each year for potential changes. Proposed changes may also be brought to the Committee by any member of the faculty, administration, or Board of Visitors. The Committee is charged to confer with other members of the faculty and the administration during the review, as appropriate.

**Procedure:**

The Committee will present its proposed revisions to the President, Provost, and Faculty Senate for discussion at least 3 weeks before a final set of recommended revisions is presented to the Faculty Senate for a vote. During a discussion meeting, the President, Provost, or Faculty Senate may recommend changes to be considered by the Committee.

The Committee will review **all** recommended changes.

At the meeting during which the Committee presents its final set of proposed changes, the Faculty Senate may accept or reject the proposed revisions, but may not amend them. Revisions that are approved by the Faculty Senate, Provost, and President are then presented to the Board of Visitors. All revisions require the formal approval of the Board of Visitors.

Any meeting where proposed revisions are presented may be a Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate.

*Before any Faculty Senate meeting where revisions are presented by the Committee, whether for discussion or vote, the revisions will have been approved by the Provost and the President.*

*All revisions require the formal approval of the Board of Visitors.*

**Proposed revision of the charge of the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee (clean copy)**

**Committee Membership:**

- Three members of the instructional faculty elected by the Faculty Senate to 3-year terms. Two faculty must be tenured and one faculty must be a term faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or higher. At least one member must be a Senator. In order to maintain continuity, the faculty members of the Committee shall have staggered terms. The Chair of the committee is appointed by and from among the elected faculty members;
- A non-voting administrator appointed by the Provost from the Provost’s office;
- A non-voting administrator from Human Resources appointed by the Vice President of Human Resources.

**Charge:**

The Committee will review the Faculty Handbook each year for potential changes. Proposed changes may also be brought to the Committee by any member of the faculty, administration, or Board of Visitors. The Committee is charged to confer with other members of the faculty and the administration during the review, as appropriate.

The Committee will present its proposed revisions to the President, Provost, and Faculty Senate for discussion at least 3 weeks before a final set of recommended revisions is presented to the Faculty Senate for a vote. During a discussion meeting, the President, Provost, or Faculty Senate may recommend changes to be considered by the Committee.

The Committee will review all recommended changes.
At the meeting during which the Committee presents its final set of proposed changes, the Faculty Senate may accept or reject the proposed revisions, but may not amend them. Revisions that are approved by the Faculty Senate, Provost, and President are then presented to the Board of Visitors. All revisions require the formal approval of the Board of Visitors.

Any meeting where proposed revisions are presented may be a Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate.
Appendix B
Final Approved Charge for the Faculty Handbook Revisions Committee

Committee Membership:

- Three members of the instructional faculty elected by the Faculty Senate to 3-year terms. Two faculty must be tenured and one faculty must be a term faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or higher. At least one member must be a Senator. In order to maintain continuity, the faculty members of the Committee shall have staggered terms. The Chair of the committee is appointed by and from among the elected faculty members;
- A non-voting administrator appointed by the Provost from the Provost’s office;
- A non-voting administrator from Human Resources appointed by the Vice President of Human Resources.

Charge:

The Committee will review the Faculty Handbook each year for potential changes. Proposed changes may also be brought to the Committee by any member of the faculty, administration, or Board of Visitors. The Committee is charged to confer with other members of the faculty and the administration during the review, as appropriate.

The Committee will present its proposed revisions to the President, Provost, and Faculty Senate for discussion at least 5 weeks before a final set of recommended revisions is presented to the Faculty Senate for a vote. During a discussion meeting, the President, Provost, or Faculty Senate may recommend changes to be considered by the Committee.

The Committee will review all recommended changes.

At the meeting during which the Committee presents its final set of proposed changes, the Faculty Senate may accept or reject the proposed revisions, but may not amend them. Revisions that are approved by the Faculty Senate are then presented to the Board of Visitors. All revisions require the formal approval of the Board of Visitors.

Any meeting where proposed revisions are presented may be a Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate.
# Appendix C

## Faculty Senate Allocation 2022-23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Department</th>
<th>Fall 2021 FT FTE</th>
<th>Fall 2021 PT FTE</th>
<th>2021 FTE TOTAL</th>
<th>Allocation 2022-2023</th>
<th>Previous Allocation 2021-22</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonin Scalia Law School</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>61.77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Educ &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>60.64</td>
<td>190.64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>48.39</td>
<td>141.39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>395.00</td>
<td>107.13</td>
<td>502.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science</td>
<td>232.00</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>259.74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Visual &amp; Perf Arts</td>
<td>94.00</td>
<td>50.16</td>
<td>144.16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter School</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>148.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schar School of Policy and Government</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>93.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering &amp; Computing</td>
<td>228.00</td>
<td>68.04</td>
<td>296.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College UN</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1884.445</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

From the Charter of the Faculty Senate, Section IB1: The threshold size for any unit to be allocated a Senate seat according to proportionality is set at the total University instructional FTE divided by the maximum number of elected Senators as stated in the Faculty Senate bylaws. In the instance that this ratio is not an integer it will be rounded up to obtain the threshold size. If all units meet or exceed the threshold size, then Senate seats are apportioned based on the total University instructional FTE. If any unit does not equal or exceed the threshold size, it will be allocated one Senate seat. The remaining Senate seats will be allocated based on the total instructional FTE of those units that equal or exceed the threshold size.
Appendix D
Reports from Other Committees

Athletic Council – submitted by Dominique Banville, Faculty Athletic Representative and Chair, Athletic Council, February 9, 2022

Report for the Faculty Senate – Update from the Athletic Council

The Athletic Council had its second meeting of the academic year on February 3, 2022. In attendance were Brad Edwards, Bethany Usher, Pam Patterson, Debi Corbatto, Nena Rogers, Zach Bolno, Malcolm Grace, Chris Green, Tatiana Link, Lamar Bell, Crystal Combes, Jacqueline Clabeaux, Joshua Walker, and Dominique Banville.

Assistant Vice-President and Director of Athletics Brad Edwards shared the celebration planned for the 50th anniversary of Title IX. Each team will recognize the impact of the legislation and highlight the accomplishments of Mason alums during a game. Videos and PSA have been created to share the voices of alumni who have thrived in athletics and their careers in part due to the opportunities provided by the landmark legislation. Milestones achievements of the Mason programs will also be underlined.

Brad provided an update on the teams’ performance athletically and academically. Mason Student-Athletes completed Fall 2021 with a 3.2 cumulative GPA, edging the student body's average of 3.04. The men’s and women’s cross-country teams were recognized for both individual and collective achievements by the United States Track & Field and Cross-Country Coaches Association (USTFCCCA).

Both the men’s and women’s programs were named Division I All-Academic Teams. This marks the 14th straight year the men’s team has received the honor and 10th consecutive year for the women. In addition, junior Annabelle Eastman was named to the USTFCCCA All-Academic Team for the second consecutive cross-country campaign. Mason will host the A10 Championship in indoor track (February 26-27) and Softball (May 12-14). Brad indicated that the Athletics Department has exceeded the university’s goal in fundraising. The goal was $900K and the amount currently collected is $1.2 M. Brad also shared the increase in media presence of the men’s basketball team on different platforms.

Dr. Debi Corbatto, Deputy AD and Senior Woman Administrator indicated that NCAA is looking at modifying the protocols once COVID cases start to decrease.

Dr. Dominique Banville provided an overview of her activities as the FAR including multiple conference calls with fellow A10 FARs (monthly basis), participation in the NCAA special convention on the proposed new constitution, virtual sessions during the annual meetings of the A10 Conference, and monthly meetings of the A10 Compliance Committee. She attended two webinars organized by the A10 Conference, on NCAA Post-graduate Scholarships and Academic Misconduct. Her plans to travel with Men and Women Basketball had to be canceled because of the desire from the teams to travel with a small party due to COVID high transmission rate. She will look to travel with other teams later in the semester.

Malcolm Grace (Deputy AD, Compliance) provided an update on the new constitution that was adopted at the special meeting of the NCAA in January. One of the major changes with this new constitution involves providing regulatory authority to each division. Student-athletes will also now have a voice on each Division’s Board of Governors and the NCAA BOG. The NCAA BOG will be dramatically reduced (from 21 to 9), their voice will be more important. The new constitution allows additional benefits like Name, Image, and Likeness (NIL) but “Pay
for Play” is still not allowed. Some legislations were passed linked to the recruiting model for men and women basketball, and the elimination of waivers for sickle cell testing.

Submitted by Dr. Dominique Banville, Faculty Athletics Representative, and Chair of the Athletic Council.

Graduate Council – submitted by Cristiana Stan, Faculty Senate Representative, February 21, 2022

Graduate Council Report
February 16, 2022
Faculty Senate meeting: March 2, 2022

The recommendation of The Graduate Education Reimagine Task Force for GMU to have a Graduate Division has been approved by the President and Provost Offices. A Graduate Division Implementation Planning process is being developed.

Respectfully Submitted by Cristiana Stan, Faculty Senate Representative to the Graduate Council 2021-2022

Grievance Committee – submitted by John Farina, Chair, February 14, 2022

The grievance committee had no new business during this period and has no cases presently before it.

John Farina, chair

Technology Policy Committee – submitted by Delton Daigle and Kevin Dunayer, Co-chairs, February 8, 2022

The Faculty Senate Technology Policy Committee met January 19th.

Members:

Delton T Daigle ddaigle@gmu.edu (Co-Chair)
Kevin S Dunayer kdunayer@gmu.edu (Co-Chair)
Jessica Matthews jmatthe2@gmu.edu
Laura L Miller lmliller@gmu.edu
Lee Andrew Solomon lsoromo@GMU.EDU
Geraldine G Walther gwalthe@GMU.EDU
Amy Hutchison ahutchi9@GMU.EDU
Below is a summary of some highlights of the meeting that included Kevin Borek (VP IT, CIO), Charlie Spann (Deputy CIO and Asst. VP), and Joy Taylor (Executive Director, Learning Support Services) providing technology updates and initiatives that are ongoing and upcoming this academic year.

**Eduroam Update**

The plan to turn off the Mason-Secure network has been put on hold. Both Mason-Secure and Eduroam will continue to be broadcast in Academic and Administrative spaces for the foreseeable future. The residence hall network has been moved to a new network supported by a 3rd party service provider, Apogee. As a result, the network in the residence halls is different. Eduroam is available in office spaces and classrooms in residence halls for faculty and staff. TPC has noted that faculty do not have Wi-Fi access in these areas and may have need of the service.

**Microsoft Intune Deployment**

Microsoft InTune has been deployed to all Windows systems that are managed by ITS. This system provides security patches and software updates to Windows endpoints. User machines do not require a VPN connection to update. As of now, 4313 Windows machines campus wide are administered by InTune.

This led to a broader discussion, which is evolving, surrounding asset ownership and university network security goals. ITS plans to configure all university-owned endpoints to receive critical security patches and software updates through a central system. This will require improved accounting for university assets.

**Redesigning George Mason’s Technology Policy Committees to be both more Responsive and Representative**

There are many committees at GMU — too many some may feel, with too much crosstalk and overlap. The technology policy committee is aware of that (see Appendix A for a quick survey that does not include several newer technology groups active and being proposed by the administrative offices), but it stands alone among the various university technology committees as a voice of faculty in the influencing decisions that directly impact the day-to-day activity of university faculty. We are at a point in our university’s development where shifts to increased online education and major shifts in software and hardware choices need to be increasingly supported by and advocated by the practitioners directly using the technology assets.

We (the TPC) propose the formation of a limited term taskforce with the charge to inventory and recommend consolidation of the committee structure under a framework that has substantial faculty participation and representation at all stages of planning and decision making. The TPC, with collaboration from Lisa Billingham and members of ITS leadership, will draft a charge for the taskforce and propose membership for presentation at the March full faculty Senate meeting.

Over the long term, we hope that by streamlining our technology committees we can more clearly communicate with all stakeholders about the goals and solutions being considered, solicit feedback, and build consensus on university directions more effectively. Only through active engagement with faculty in major technology directions (such as a new LMS) can ITS work with us to satisfy our goals of effectively teaching and conducting research.

**Additional Perspective provided by ITS**
What follows is the additional guidance provided to faculty Senate by ITS after our meeting. This was not the business of the committee, nor was it discussed, supported, or promoted by any faculty members comprising the committee:

**Instructional Technology Roadmap**

Technology investments meant to support teaching and learning, are occurring in isolation in committees across the University including groups like the Learning Environments Group (LEG), Instructional Continuity (IC) Group and the Technology Policy Committee (TPC).

In response to concerns from the faculty (through IC and TPC) about piloting the newest version of Bb at the time it was being proposed, it was discussed instead, that the University would engage in an RFP to determine the future of Mason’s enterprise LMS. Similar discussions are also occurring about classroom technology in committees like LEG and Facilities Management.

The recommendation is to holistically gather requirements from “lessons learned” during the past two years, leveraging groups that already operated in these spaces, as apply it to what we believe the future state of instruction to be and prioritize our investments. This would lead to a service/technology roadmap for instructional technologies at Mason, inclusive of classroom technology, LMS services and related back-office applications/technology to support in-class, hybrid and remote (or purely on-line) learning.

ITS will coordinate the conversations working with the leadership of these stakeholder committees.

**Academic Software**

Managing and acquiring academic software management, including funding, support, etc. continues to be a topic of discussion. While it does overlap with the technology roadmap, it mostly stands on its own and isn’t part of the other narrative, except where it touches the room systems. ITS is supportive a central model for delivering widely used instructional software and have recently completed an inventory/requirements survey with Accenture. [Note: TPS did not support this proposal when brought to our attention at a previous meeting. We look forward so seeing the Accenture report, but as yet, that report has not been shared.]

The recommendation moving forward is to leverage the Accenture engagement; publish the inventory; engage with the community on the results (including faculty); review its findings and begin the process of prioritizing and implementing its recommendations. These activities will occur in February/March timeframe.

Respectively submitted by Delton Daigle and Kevin Dunayer Co-Chairs of the FSTP
REGISTRATION REMINDER: “How the Word is Passed”  
(February 25 @ 10am ET)

Register at:

https://atlantic10.formstack.com/forms/how_the_word_is_passed_registration
LIST OF ATTENDEES

March 2, 2022: 133


Visitors present: LaShonda Anthony (Director, Academic Integrity), Lester Arnold (Vice President, Human Resources and Payroll), Laurence Bray (Associate Provost, Graduate Education), Lisa Breglia (Senior Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Affairs, CHSS), Alecia Bryan (Associate Director of Development/CHSS), Crystal Hall Buckley (Senior Associate Director, Graduate Admissions), Delton Daigle (Co-chair, Faculty Senate Technology Policy Committee), Kimberly Jackson Davidson (University Ombudsperson), Shannon Davis (Associate Dean for Faculty and Academic Affairs, Mason Korea), Matt DeSantis (Executive Director, Institutional Effectiveness, OIEP), Deb Dickenson (Vice President for Finance, Fiscal Services), Kathleen Diemer (Associate Vice President, Advancement Relations), Kim Dight (Chief Business Officer, CHSS), Fatou Diouf (Term Assistant Professor, Info Systems and Operations Management), Cheryl Druehl (Interim Senior Associate Dean/Associate Dean for Faculty, School of Business), Gesele Durham (Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning), Kim Eby (Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Development), K. Pierre Eklou (Assistant Professor, CHHS, Nursing), Kim Ford (Director of Personnel Operations, Office of the Provost), Kenneth Foreman (Assistant Professor, Chemistry and Biochemistry), Cynthia Fuchs (Interim Director, Film and Video Studies, CVPA), Charlotte Gill (Associate Professor, Criminology, Law and Society), Marcy Glover (Coordinator, Academic Administration, Office of the Provost), Lisa Gring-Pemble (Gift Acceptance Committee, Associate Professor, Foundations, School of Business), Renate Guilford (Associate Provost for Academic Administration), Marjorie Haley (Professor, TCDEL, CEHD), Molli Herth (Program Manager, Faculty Affairs and Development, Office of the Provost), Caitlyn Horan (Assistant Dean, Graduate Academic Services, School of Business), Toshia Johnson (Associate Director, Academic Integrity), Rebecca Jones (Chair of Faculty, COS and Professor, Chemistry and Biochemistry), Matt Kelly (Operations and Initiatives Manager, Office of the Senior Vice President), David Kidd (University Building Official), Jason Kinser (Dept. Chair and Associate Professor, Computational and Data Sciences, COS), Senior Vice President Carol Kissal, Laura Kosoglu (Associate Professor and Associate Dept. Chair, Civil, Environmental, and Infrastructure Engineering), Lauren Kuykendall (Associate Professor, Psychology), Vincent Lacovara (Associate Vice President, Institutional Compliance, Office of University Audit), Tim Leslie (Associate Professor, Geography and Geoinformation Science), Jaime Lester (Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs, Strategic Initiatives, CHSS), Kimberly MacVaugh (Vice-Chair, Librarians’ Council), Christopher Magee (Social Sciences Librarian), Karen Manley (Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning), Alexandra Masterson (Assistant Professor, Biology), Doug McKenna (University Registrar), Janette Muir (Vice Provost, Academic Affairs), Lisa Nguyen (Associate Director, Data Analytics, OIEP), Amanda Ogis (Assistant Dean, CHSS Undergraduate Academic Affairs), Eunkyoung Park (Director, Co-Curricular Assessment, OIEP), Shernita Parker (Assistant VP/HR Strategy and Talent Manager), Sarah Parnell (Operations and Administration Manager, Office of the Provost), Pam Promisel (Consultant Manager, University Business Consulting), Cesar Jon Rebellon (Professor, Criminology, Law and
Society), Allison Redlich (Associate Chair, Criminology, Law and Society), Lauren Reuscher (Staff Senator), Marguerite Rippy (Associate Dean, Graduate Academic Affairs, CHSS), Erin Icanangelo Rogers (SciTech Event Coordinator and Chair, Staff Senate), Carole Rosenstein (Associate Professor, Arts Management, CVPA), Pallab Sanyal (Professor and Area Chair, Information Systems and Operations Management), Cathy Saunders (Instructional Professor of English), Susan Schriefer (MOL Academic Program Leader, Pamela Shepherd (Director of Communications, Office of the Provost), John Shortle (Chair/Professor, Systems Engineering and Operations Research), Margaret Slavin (Associate Professor, Nutrition and Food Studies), Matt Smith (Director of Accreditation, Office of the Provost), Charlie Spann (Assistant VP/Deputy CIO, Enterprise Service Delivery, ITS), Jasmine Spitler (Assessment Librarian, University Libraries), Frank Strike (Vice President, Facilities), Kate Sweeney (Journalism Coordinator/Instructor, Communication, CHSS), Cathy Tompkins (Professor, Social Work, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, CHHS), Michelle Trejo (Faculty Senate Liaison, Student Government), Girum Urgessa (Associate Professor/CEIE), Bethany Usher (Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education), Eleanor Weis (Director of Development, CHSS), Wendy Watkins (Associate University Auditor, Office of University Audit), Preston Williams (Presidential Communications Manager, Office of Communications), Bob Witeck (BOV Liaison to the Faculty Senate), Elizabeth Woodley (University Ethics Officer, Institutional Compliance), Courtney Wooten (Associate Chair, Assistant Professor, English, CHSS), Stephen Zhou (Graduate and Professional Students Association (GAPSFA).