GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
November 16, 2022
Electronic Meeting, 3:00-4:15 p.m.

Number of Attendees: 113 [List of names]

I. Call to Order: Chair Melissa Broeckelman-Post (MBP) called the meeting to order at 3:00pm.

II. Approval of the Minutes of October 26, 2022: Approved as submitted.

III. Opening Remarks

• The Senate held a moment of silence in solidarity and sorrow with our colleagues and friends at the University of Virginia and the University of Idaho, in recognition of the recent tragedies at those institutions.
• MBP welcomed Jennifer Messier, who will be filling in as a senator for Lisa Lister for the rest of the Fall semester.
• President Washington recently announced new dependent tuition benefit – an example of a really successful shared governance mission. This conversation started in the Faculty Senate and led to a discussion between then-BOV liaison Tom Davis and the Senate Nominations Committee, followed by a joint resolution of the Faculty and Staff Senates, and then a working group. The hope is to eventually extend this benefit to all employees, but this is an enormous first step that benefits our community members who can use it the most.
• Reminder to Senators to be logged into Microsoft Teams in order to vote.

IV. Committee Reports

Senate Standing Committees

• Executive Committee
  o In our last meeting received report from the Task Force for Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards (TFRFRR) and a preview of the Gallup Survey results.
  o Stay tuned for ideas about how to build faculty community.
• Academic Policies – no report
• Budget and Resources – no report
• Faculty Matters
  o Ben Steger will be co-chairing this committee along with Solon Simmons.
  o In discussions with Gallup about incorporating Faculty Evaluation of Administrators into future surveys.
  o Raised concern that the vote on the resolution opposing Virginia Department of Education’s model policies at the last meeting went directly to a secret ballot and was not transparent. Feeling that a civil rights-related vote should be transparent.
    ▪ MBP: Clarification – for hybrid meetings we always use ballots because voices are not equally loud in the room and on Zoom, so it is not always possible to distinguish what the voice vote is. The minutes do reflect the actual voting results.
Response: May want to revisit this – important to see how people voted on important issues like civil rights, as elected representatives of our schools.

Question: Would the Senate support moving to a truly transparent voting system where our colleagues would know our individual vote on matters?
   - MBP: Question is related to revising standing rules and bylaws, which is not on the agenda today. We could discuss in a future meeting.

Nominations
   - The Committee puts forward Jennifer Messier to temporarily replace Lisa Lister on Faculty Matters until Lisa returns, and Solon Simmons as the temporary replacement for Lisa on the Term Faculty Committee (note: Term Faculty Committee representative has to be an existing member of Faculty Matters).
     - No nominees from the floor, approved by acclamation.
   - Requesting nominees for the Shuttle Advisory Committee – must be a senator.
     - Tom Wood self-nominated, approved by acclamation.

Organization and Operations – no report

Other Committees/Faculty Representatives

Task Force on Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards
   - MBP turned over the role of Presiding Officer to Chair Pro Tem Charlotte Gill in order to speak as co-chair of the Task Force. Co-chairs Kim Eby and Lisa Billingham also presented.
   - Background to the Task Force
     - Established by the Faculty Senate in Fall 2021 to explore how to align faculty workload and reward structures to reflect dual goals of being an R1 university that provides both world-changing research and accessible, transformational education. Idea was to develop a more inclusive faculty structure that recognizes the many ways in which faculty contribute to the university’s success.
     - Acknowledged members of the Task Force who have met for an hour and a half every other week for over a year.
   - Task Force charge had three parts:
     - Analyze institutional needs; policies, procedures, and processes; contracts and RPT changes
     - Identify potential models and best practices related to breadth of faculty roles, workloads, and appointment types
     - Create an implementation plan based on potential models and feedback from Community Forum and surveys
       - Focus of work since last presentation in April
       - Sharing vision, goals, and five-year implementation plan today.
   - Implementation plan goals
     - Creating inclusive and transparent workload guidelines
     - Redesigning RPT guidelines
• Developing a strategy for implementing continuous contracts for full-time instructional and clinical faculty
• Aligning annual review criteria with RPT criteria and workload
• Implementing career development for all faculty.

○ Process for achieving goals
  • Appendix G of the Task Force’s report outlines a proposed 5-year timeline for implementation, accounting for interdependencies and sequencing of goals
  • Most follow the same process:
    • Achieve clarity about existing practices in each unit
    • Revise/update policies and practices as needed based on recommended best practices
    • Implement and pilot changes
    • Evaluate how the implementation works and assess what else needs to be updated.

○ Implications for Mason faculty
  • Most policies and documents governing workload, annual evaluations, and promotion are refined and implemented at the Local Academic Unit (LAU) level, and firmly in the purview of faculty governance, so achieving these outcomes will require faculty time, input, and expertise and managing change at multiple levels.
  • Achieving these outcomes will take time, but process must be faculty driven and supported to be successful.

○ Intended impacts
  • Mason faculty workloads will be evaluated through transparent workload guidelines that are inclusive of the full scope of faculty contributions.
  • RPT guidelines will account for DEI work, community engagement, service and/or leadership in faculty governance, and administrative leadership.
  • Full-time instructional and clinical term faculty will be afforded continuous contracts in line with a specific promotion tier.
  • Faculty will be evaluated for promotion based on promotion expectations that are adjusted to align with their workload expectations and annual review criteria.
  • Faculty at different ranks and career stages will be provided with career development support.

○ Actions needed: Faculty Senate asked to support two motions intended to continue moving the work forward.
  • Motion 1: Endorse the goals shared today and in the report
  • Motion 2: Charge O&O with converting the Task Force into a Standing University Committee.

○ Questions prior to formally putting motions on the floor
  • First, response to question posed via email by Senator Tim Gibson about why we are using the word “continuing contracts” instead of “tenure.”
    • MBP: Legally and contractually, in Virginia public universities we have contracts without term rather than tenure. The term
“tenure” is only used internally. We chose the term “continuous contracts” for two reasons:
  - Allows us to work with our legal counsel to find language we can actually use when we get into formalizing contractual stability in the Faculty Handbook
  - This is the language already used at Virginia Tech, so we have a precedent within the state.

▪ Question: Does the motion to endorse the goals also include endorsement of the recommendations associated with the goals?
  - MBP: The recommendations are the action plan that the Task Force sees unfolding, but a lot of people need to be involved so it’s an ongoing process. The recommendation timeline is how we expect and hope things to go forward, but a lot of this will happen at the department level and some departments are further along than others.

▪ Follow-up question: So what do you actually envision for a plan of work as part of the annual reviews for faculty?
  - MBP: Right now every department has wildly varying processes, and some don’t do annual reviews at all. So there is also an annual evaluation working group that Lisa and Kim are co-chairing along with others within the university. They are looking at best practices, what’s already happening around Mason, and will be putting forth recommendations. After that it will be up to departments to think about whether and how they might revise their annual evaluations to match those best practices. We don’t expect there to be one central, single process.
  - Don’t yet know what the evaluation working group will propose, but might anticipate things like a rubric for evaluation qualitative feedback, etc. Our role is to make sure everyone gets a fair and transparent annual evaluation.

▪ Question: Appreciate the impressive work that went into this. Appendix C of the report notes the importance of tenure for academic freedom, but don’t see academic freedom much in this report and not at all in the goals and timeline (Appendix G). Did the Task Force investigate the relationship between contract terms and academic freedom, and if so why does it not appear in the plan for future work?
  - Kim Eby (KE): Most of our conversations were about how responsibilities are divided up for individual people, i.e. how we could get alignment across the different roles for faculty members who are playing multiple roles.
  - Obviously academic freedom protections are essential. Nationally there are initiatives to strengthen and protect academic freedom that I think are really important for us to consider; e.g. at the University of Colorado Boulder – their academic affairs website in the Office of the Provost provides a definition, why it’s so important, FAQ, and a guide to
scholarship and safety that’s explicitly connected to online resources. We do have a free speech page with a link to our policy, but the tone is a bit different from other institutions that are leading in this space.

- I also think this should be inclusive of broader members of our community, not just full-time faculty members, which was the scope of the charge of this group. I hope this is a conversation we can have moving forward.

**Question:** Does the term “continuing contracts” include a broader set of faculty?

**MBP:** It’s a broad umbrella term because there are a lot of legal ramifications and state policies we have to take into account in terms of talking about tenure. Other universities use different terms and implement it in different ways, but essentially it’s the same as a contract without term. Thanks to the work of the Term Faculty Committee we already have the possibility of three- and five-year contracts for instructional and clinical term faculty. This goal is to say that after that we should have an opportunity for a continuous contract.

- The one group we can’t include in this is our research faculty who are on soft money, so that’s why we really intentionally use the language “instructional and clinical faculty.” Research faculty positions are grant dependent so were not included as part of our charge.

**Question:** While we are technically on “contracts without term,” the Faculty Handbook contains multiple references to the word “tenure” and specific procedures that prevent us from getting dismissed without a full review. Would continuous contracts be equivalent to tenure in terms of being backed up by precisely the same protections that tenured faculty have? How do they do it at Virginia Tech?

**MBP:** For the first part of the question, that would be the job of the Faculty Handbook Revisions Committee – to help get that language right and ensure those protections are in place. That committee will be really critical. This is a five-year process – that is the next part.

**KE:** Can’t specifically speak about Virginia Tech without looking at their handbook, but a number of institutions have similar processes, including our peers. We wouldn’t be leading edge if we were to do this. There are plenty of precedents we could look at, within the bounds of the laws of the Commonwealth. We’d also have to be in conversation with university counsel about the exigencies of these contracts. There are specifications for the order of operations should we hit financial hard times, etc – we’d have to figure out how to spell out similar equivalents.

**Question:** Thank you to the Task Force for creating such great recommendations and goals. We as a department have been working on our own policies and so has the college, and now the Task Force will
be working on policies too. How will each level interact with each other so that we can have a common policy that also works for individual units?

- MBP: Several colleges and schools have been developing workload guidance that’s also going down to departments for review. Jaime Lester has been deeply involved in this with CHSS, if she is here and can speak to this. It’s like a nation and state model – you have some guidelines at the national level, but at the state and local level they are implemented in much more detail. So I see these levels as working together, but the actual work of identifying workload guidelines has to be within this unit.

- Jaime Lester: In CHSS we have an internal governance unit called the Faculty Assembly, and we engaged with them to create workload guidelines alongside our tenure track and tenured faculty guidelines. It was voted in by the faculty. I like to think of it similar to P&T, where we start with a handbook and must always be in compliance. We then create college-level P&T guidelines that have an additional layer of specificity. We get faculty input through faculty governance, and then a continued articulation and specificity of the guidelines at the department level to account for the many important disciplinary differences. It’s like a ‘rolling up’ to higher levels of specificity.

- Question: How much will individual units have flexibility? I understand the nation/state idea, but a lot of the problems that are being resolved here, while serious, are not problems we have at the Law School and implementing some of these recommendations would be outside other law school norms. How much of this would be mandatory?

  - KE: You took the time to write a super helpful letter about this last spring, so thank you for that. The law school is a good example and you have very specific guidelines to maintain your accreditation. So we are well aware that LAUs and schools/colleges need flexibility to be consistent with disciplinary norms.

  - We do need to be mindful of equity. Our research shows that when there are no boundaries or guard rails and colleges end up doing things very differently there can be either perceived or actual inequity when there’s an opportunity for some people to be rewarded in ways others are not.

  - This will be an ongoing negotiation across multiple layers of the institution and shows why this kind of institutional change is so ambitious and challenging. But we have shown ourselves capable of these kinds of changes already in a number of spaces, so I think we could continue conversations to get to a place where parties were happy.

- Motion 1 proposed by Lisa Billingham and seconded by Dominique Banville: We ask the Faculty Senate to endorse the goals laid out in the final report from the TFRFRR.
Discussion on the motion

• Comment: Concern about the models mentioned at other universities. University of Colorado Boulder has had some concerns about academic freedom and reduction of tenure-line positions. Virginia Tech has different categories of tenure and may not use the terms “tenure” and “continuing contracts” interchangeably. Would like to see more detailed information and research about these proposed models.

• Comment: Share this concern – “continuing contracts” is vague. At Washington State University it appears to be equivalent to our existing 3-5 year contracts. Not comfortable voting for this without a better understanding of what this means and what power it might give the administration to dismiss faculty without going through the proper process. Also, a huge proportion of our undergraduates are being taught by term or contract professors who do not enjoy the full protection of academic freedom. A lot of power is based in the contract. It’s important that we get this right – tenure isn’t a badge or reward, it’s there to protect students too, so we really need to solve the problem of students at Mason learning from faculty who aren’t protected in that way.

• MBP: Clarification – the goal of the motion is to say this is the direction we want to move in. We want to have more contract stability for term faculty, transparency and clarity in reviews, promotion, and workload guidance, and mentoring processes. We want to make sure everyone feels supported. This is one of the concerns faculty have raised really clearly in the COACHE survey. This report isn’t spelling out every detail of how it’s going to play out yet, it’s letting us keep moving forward and figuring out whether to get it right – it’s an iterative process. Not just about whether we use the word “tenure” or not.

• Comment: Echo what MBP said. Looking at Appendix G of the report, the first thing that needs to be done is to approve Faculty Handbook language for implementing continuous contracts. The Faculty Handbook Committee would need to take this on, and that’s where this language would start to emerge. They may feel like they don’t have enough information and need to have some back and forth. I’m worried that if we say we need to get this part right first, it’s going to delay all of the work that needs to happen for the next few years.

• Comment: This is more of a momentum generator than a decision-making instrument. I support this because it would be nice to move it forward and then we’ll need a lot of expert advice at the Faculty Handbook stage – the committee will be inviting people to speak to these issues to make sure we really get them right. I think the concerns raised are real and interesting; I also think we will have an opportunity to work through these things with the administration.
• Comment: Agree, don’t make perfect the enemy of the good. This allows us to get a good start and we can debate these issues in the next phase.

• Comment: The way I read it is, this is not a definite determination on certain wording. It just gives us momentum to go forward; there is no need to go back to the Task Force to redo this.

• Comment: I agree with everyone’s comments and understand the need to move forward, but if the goal was to look at job security and reappointment and create some form of equality between tenure-line, tenured, and term faculty, I’m not sure the language in this document does that. It very much makes it a distinctive process in my mind. For that reason I have concerns – I’m not opposed to it but I’m not entirely in support of it. By voting for this motion are we saying this is now the charge we’re giving to the Faculty Handbook Committee that this is the framework you’re working from and we’re no longer looking for equality and security in reappointment, etc?

• Comment: I think this is not simply a procedural issue. I don’t think the concerns about arbitrary dismissal and non-renewal are ‘details,’ they have been part of American university culture since at least 1915, certainly since 1940, and are at the heart of the work of this university.

• Comment: Adding my voice to concerns about limiting the charge. There are a lot of other issues involved in a ‘two-tier system’ – many opportunities that tenure-track faculty get that term faculty are shut out of. I know there’s been some work but they seem to be outside the boundaries of this charge. There’s a lot of things I’d like to see considered and I’m concerned that this is too narrow, will leave things out.
  o MBP response: I don’t disagree these are important issues, but they were not part of the Task Force’s charge.
  o Response: Aren’t they by definition part of reimagining faculty roles and rewards?
  o MBP response: Not based on the charge we had. I think it’s an important conversation that we need to have and move forward with, but it wasn’t part of what we were asked to do as a committee.

• Comment: If we were to vote no, would this stop any of the forward process? If we vote yes, does it pigeonhole us into the continuous contracts issue or is there room to still work on this?
  o MBP response: Voting yes is saying we want to keep working on these goals – a lot of work left to do but we want to keep moving forward. There’s a second motion that will come to the floor about making this a standing committee, so it’s not a task force with no clear
continuity. Those two motions together with a yes vote is to keep us moving and having conversations – not meant to be limiting.

- Keith Renshaw: Clarification as Parliamentarian – the charge for the task force indicates that this is its last activity, by definition the end of the task force. From Parliamentarian standpoint, a no vote means ‘thanks task force, you’re done’ unless we come up with something new for them to do. A yes vote means we are endorsing the goals in the final report and a yes vote on the second motion that will come means to turn it into a standing committee to continue the work.

- Tim Gibson moved to postpone the motion for reconsideration the first meeting of the Spring semester so that the Task Force can bring more specificity about what is meant by continuous contracts and the protection they would afford. This was seconded.

  - Discussion on the motion
    - Comment: I’m concerned that this is going to drag things out, and that the Task Force is going to come back with a variety of terms we already know were probably going to be considered, and we’d be right back where we were. We need full Faculty Senate input on getting the terms right, and I think the venue for this is to have the Faculty Handbook Committee work on it first and bring back to the Senate. We could say the Task Force should do this instead, but then everything’s on hold. Whereas if we move forward the new Standing Committee and the Faculty Handbook could work collaboratively. I think the only thing postponing this is going to do will delay us starting on this, it doesn’t address the actual concerns. People have really strong feelings about this and it is a university discussion that we all need to have.
    - Comment: I feel like we’re being told two separate things – one is that the motion just moves things forward and the other is that it actually has some substance to it because we’re endorsing the goals. Could we just strike Motion 1, if the next step really is just procedural? We can just say we’ll move this forward to the Faculty Handbook Committee. The only reason for Motion 1 is to say we think these are appropriate goals. I do not think they’re appropriate for the reasons laid out. Motion 1 has some substance to it.
    - Comment: I support postponing the motion to January to give more clarity for those who want it.
    - Comment: The problem here is goal number 3, as we all know, and the problem is that will still be the case in January. I can imagine a modification of goal 3 – e.g.
looking at relative equality of benefits, compensation, security, re-employment processes for term vs tenure-line faculty. I wonder if this needs to be postponed for 2 months just to make that kind of modification.

- Comment: When I think about the business of the Handbook itself, I don’t think these goals are going to make a big presence. I think they’ll inform changes. Whether or not the goals support academic freedom is very contentious. Then there’s the question of whether we can move the process forward to set up a standing committee and get the Handbook part moving. That’s one thing I want to endorse whatever we vote on. I’m less worried about not being able to agree on goals because procedures, not goals, make their way into the Handbook.

- Comment: I believe the Task Force has worked very hard and come up with broad goals to try to embrace all the ideas that have been put forward. I think that postponing the motion would just delay the work and I’m against the motion to postpone.

- Question: It sounds like there’s a charge for the Task Force to do something built into the motion to postpone. Is that just to clarify what continuous contract means, or something else?
  - MBP response: The motion is to postpone and you could send feedback to the committee. We want to say these goals are worth pursuing – we don’t have the power to implement any of them. I don’t know what the committee would do in the next 2 months to change anything after 15 months of work.

- Comment: I apologize for not having said it yet – I really do appreciate the hard work that went into this, and I think there’s a lot of value. But I do think the ambiguity of goal 3 is a real problem. I think the Senate is the forum for resolving the issue of what we mean by continuous contracts and the protections they afford – the Faculty Handbook Committee is a very small group of which two out of five members are administrators. We need to figure it out here and then charge the committee level to do the detailed work.

- Dominique Banville moved to call the question on the motion to postpone. The Senate voted by acclamation to call the question.
- The Senate attempted a voice vote on the motion to postpone that was too close to call. An electronic ballot was shared.
  - Yes: 19, No: 24. The motion to postpone did not pass.
  - Keith Renshaw made a motion to extend the meeting until 4:30pm – seconded and passed.
• Continued discussion on Motion 1
  • Comment: First, I don’t think we need this motion. If we really just want to move things forward we can decline the motion and vote on Motion 2, which will keep the ball rolling without locking us into goals that many of us are uncomfortable with. Second, I think goal 3 is based on a misunderstanding of the Virginia Tech handbook, which has something called continuing contracts specifically for librarians. Without seeing further research I don’t trust that these goals are factually accurate. Third, there is no goal here that protects faculty from arbitrary dismissal or non-renewal. I hope we can vote down Motion 1 and, if we want to, go forward with Motion 2.
  • Comment: I agree that the work doesn’t hinge on Motion 1, but my big takeaway is that (1) this issue about what we call things isn’t going to be solved now or in January – people have lots of different opinions and it has ramifications all over the board. I’m also nervous because I agree we shouldn’t just send this to the Faculty Handbook Committee, I think it needs to be a faculty-wide discussion. Personally I don’t think it matters what the goals say because the meat is what goes in the Handbook. That’s the part I want us to be engaged in. I don’t want to be locked into doing that today or by January – we’re going to need several meetings, town halls, forums. I just want to make sure we get to Motion 2 and vote on that.
  • Comment: It seems to me that these are broad goals that generally we approve of, and they’re not exclusive – they don’t say these are the only goals that will be used. We could easily say we support these goals but also want additional goals related to academic freedom. Simply supporting the goals doesn’t mean we’re restricting what follows only to those goals. Goal 3 will take a lot of work to figure out, but the idea that we want contracts that do continue instead of short choppy contracts is encapsulated there, and that’s a useful and worthwhile starting point to build on. I’d rather say ‘these are good goals, now let’s get some work done.’ I’d vote for both motions.
• An electronic ballot was distributed to Senators to vote on Motion 1.
  • Yes: 22, No: 7, Abstain: 4. Motion 1 to endorse the Task Force goals passed.

- Athletic Council
- Committee on External Academic Relations
- Mason Core Committee

V. Adjournment – the meeting was adjourned at 4:28pm. The remainder of the Task Force discussion and voting on Motion 2 will be on the agenda for the December 7 Senate meeting.
APPENDIX A
TASK FORCE ON REIMAGINING FACULTY ROLES AND REWARDS

The slides presented by the Task Force on Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards follow on the next pages.
Task Force on Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards

Presentation to the Faculty Senate
November 16, 2022

- Melissa Broeckelman-Post, co-chair
- Kim Eby, co-chair
- Esperanza Roman Mendoza (CHSS)
- Courtney Adams Wooten (CHSS)
- Laura Poms (CHHS)
- Isaac Gang (CEC)
- Guadalupe Correa-Cabrera (Schar)
- Amitava Dutta (SBUS)
- Regina Biggs (CEHD)
- Mara Schoeny (Carter)
- Daniel Garrison (CEC)
- Lisa Billingham (CVPA)
- Ken Ball (CEC)
- Jaime Lester (CHSS)
- Rosemarie Higgins (CHHS)
- Geri Grant (COS)
What was our charge?

Analyze institutional needs
• Policies, procedures, and processes related to faculty roles/workloads/positions and contractual stability
• RPT changes that address a broader range of faculty contributions

Identify potential models and best practices
• Articulate opportunities for each
• Articulate challenges and potential models for each

Develop an implementation plan
• Policies, procedures, and decision-making entities
• Processes for faculty role/workload/position changes and contractual stability
• RPT changes
Task Force Work Summary

1. October '21
   Finalized and convened committee

2. November-December
   Researched and explored best/promising practices

3. January-February
   Identified potential models and developed three options for feedback

4. February
   Held community forum and conducted faculty feedback survey

5. March-April
   Analyzed data, presented to Faculty Senate

6. July '22-November '22
   Refined goals and drafted Task Force report
Key Takeaways from Spring Feedback

1. Incremental change is important for avoiding unintended consequences
2. Concern about protecting R1 status
3. Ready to implement evergreen (continuous) contracts for non-tenure-track faculty as a first step
4. Desire for more flexibility and equity in workload for faculty
5. Need for salary equity between tenure-line and non-tenure-line faculty
6. Flexibility and equity across the institution need to be balanced carefully
7. Need to align workload, annual reviews, and promotion guidelines
8. Need for broader, more inclusive RPT guidelines for scholarship and creative activity
9. Need clear guidelines for excellence in teaching at LAU level
Task Force Work Summary

1. October '21
Finalized and convened committee

2. November-December
Researched and explored best/promising practices

3. January-February
Identified potential models and developed three options for feedback

4. February
Held community forum and conducted faculty feedback survey

5. March- April
Analyzed data, presented to Faculty Senate

6. July '22- November '22
Refined goals and drafted Task Force report
**Goals** (see Appendix G for 5-year plan)

**Goal 1:** Create **transparent workload guidelines** that are equitable and inclusive of all faculty appointment types.

**Goal 2:** Redesign **RPT** guidelines that represent more inclusive frameworks for all faculty work.

**Goal 3:** Develop a strategy for implementing **continuous contracts** for full-time instructional and clinical faculty.

**Goal 4:** Align **annual review** criteria with RPT criteria and account for proportionate teaching/mentoring; research/creative work; service; and leadership/administrative duties.

**Goal 5:** Create a robust culture of faculty cohesiveness through **career development** for all.
1. Identify existing practices
2. Revise
3. Pilot Changes
4. Evaluate and assess
Our Five-Year Vision:

- Mason faculty workloads will be evaluated through transparent workload guidelines that are inclusive of the full scope of faculty contributions.
- RPT guidelines will account for DEI work, community engagement, service and/or leadership in faculty governance, and administrative leadership.
- Full-time instructional and clinical term faculty will be afforded continuous contracts in line with a specific promotion tier.
- Faculty will be evaluated for promotion based on promotion expectations that are adjusted to align with their workload expectations and annual review criteria.
- Faculty at different ranks and career stages will be provided with career development support.
Motion 1:

The Faculty Senate endorses the goals laid out in the final report from the Task Force on Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards.
Motion 2:

The Faculty Senate charges the Organization and Operations Committee with creating a charge to convert the current Task Force on Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards into a University Standing Committee and to bring that to the full Faculty Senate for a vote in Spring 2023.
Final report:
https://resources.gmu.edu/facstaff/senate/TFRFRR_Final_Report.pdf
APPENDIX B
OTHER COMMITTEES

Athletic Council
Submitted by Dominique Banville

The Athletic Council met on October 25, 2022. In attendance were: Nena Rogers, Bethany Usher, Pam Patterson, Malcolm Grace, Zack Bolno, Rachel Elliot, Stacy Wilson, Lisa Rabin, Patrick McCavitt, Jacqueline Clabeaux, Joshua Walker, and Dominique Banville

Nena Rogers, interim AD, is welcomed in her new role. She stated that student-athletes (SAs) are at the forefront of every decision that is being made in the ICA department. She mentioned that more than ever this year we have a number of SAs at the graduate level because of the extra year SAs received during COVID. We were able therefore to retain not only their athletic talent but also their academic talent. She reminds members of the committee that Mason has over 500 SAs within 22 teams. She also provided a preliminary time frame for the hiring of the next AD. A search firm, yet to be identified, will be helping with the task, and a search committee will be in place soon. The hope is to conduct interviews starting in February and have the next AD on board between May and July, which is a typical time frame to conduct this type of search.

Zack Bolno (Deputy AD, External Operations), provided a recap of the Fall season and what is coming up, while Malcolm Grace (Deputy AD, Compliance) updated the committee on issues related to Name, Image and Likeness (NIL) and the transfer portal.

Dr. Dominique Banville, Faculty Athletic Representative, shared her activities since the last meeting including submitting an NCAA post-graduate scholarship application on behalf of Natalia Kanos (Rowing) who successfully obtain $10K to pursue a graduate degree, and submitting the A10 $5K post-graduate scholarship nomination for Mason, which this year went to Olivia O’Brien (Lacrosse). She administered the End of the Year Survey to all SAs, and provided a report to ICA, and the Office of the President. She participated in a number of conference calls with fellow A10 FARs, and members of the NCAA Division I Progress Toward Degree Committee. She attended, along with Nena, Todd Bramble (Deputy AD, Intercollegiate Sports), and Dr. Derek Vigon (Sports Psychologist), the A10 Mental Health Workshop held on Monday, October 17 in Washington, DC. The workshop provided an opportunity to reflect on what we are currently doing in each of our institutions, share best practices, and generate discussion within our Mason delegation and among all the other institutions as to what should be done to improve the mental health of our SAs. Dominique will be attending the FAR conference in Indianapolis on November 3-5 where the A10 FARs will also have their annual meeting.
Committee on External Academic Relations (CEAR)

Submitted by Isaac Gang & Chaowei (Pill) Yang, Co-Chairs, Committee on External Academic Relations (CEAR)

On Friday September 16 (from 1-2:00 PM ET) CEAR leadership met to discuss the representation and activities for 2022-2023, and reached the following consensus:

I. Isaac Gang and Phil Yang will serve as co-chairs as well as Faculty Senate of Virginia (FSVA) Representatives.

II. Kerri Lacharite will serve as Virginia Faculty Senate representative, joining Gang, Yang, Jatin Ambegaonkar (from CEAR), and Melissa Broeckelman-Post (Faculty Senate Chair) to complete GMU’s quota of 5 representatives.

III. CEAR resolved to continue its activities in the AY2022-2023 as followed:
   a. Communicate with Mason Rep to Richmond for information exchange
   b. Reach out to local and regional offices of state and national senators/members of congress to promote issues that are in GMU’s interest
   c. Increase awareness of State’s low funding level for Mason students and faculty considering the living expense, etc.
   d. Bring Mason voice to Virginia Faculty Senate, and take back state wide concerns to Mason Faculty Senate
   e. Communicate with Faculty Senate and our home school/college about information or issues of concern.

On Saturday October 22, 2022, CEAR’s representative, Kerri LaCharite, attended the Faculty Senate of Virginia (FSVA) Fall meeting that discussed this year’s agenda. In this meeting, several items of interest came up:

   o Budget Update
     o The FSVA account is up to about $32,000. This is in part because of the pandemic. In-person meeting costs have gone down, although that will change.
   o American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Report
     o Governor Youngkin has asked several things of Virginia universities
       ▪ To address Academic Freedom of Speech. He wants something similar to the University of Chicago statement. Here is a link to an article about it- https://www.economist.com/united-states/2016/01/30/hard-to-say
       ▪ Defining antisemitism to refrain criticism of Israel. This includes within faculty members’ research.
       ▪ For universities to report political parties of candidates in the hiring process. William & Mary and other institutions have replied this is illegal.
   o FSVA Membership
     ▪ FSVA resolved to increase its visibility by reaching more faculty members (this can be done by “harvesting” faculty emails and improving the current FSVA database)
   o Virginia Higher Education Advocacy Day
     ▪ January 12, 2023
     ▪ FSVA resolved to advocate for high-speed Internet access in Virginia.
     ▪ FSVA proposed a subcommittee to work on legislative agenda (Mason is represented by 2 or three volunteers)
   o Faculty Representation on Board of Visitors
     ▪ This was a lengthy discussion on whether faculty representation is mandated and if those individuals are 1) Faculty Senate Chairs or the previous Faculty Senate Chair (and therefore elected); 2) Elected by the faculty; or 3) appointed by administration.
- FSVA shared how our respective Senate leaders interact with and are/aren’t represented on our institution’s BOV (or equivalent body)

**Unfinished Business**
- Identification of Post-election agenda including the issue of tuition waiver for employee dependents

**Mason Core Committee**

Submitted by Debra Stroiney

**Committee members:**
Laura Poms, Bethany Usher, Abena Aidoo, Anne Verhoeven, Courtney Wooten, Samaine Lockwood, Deb Stroiney, Lauren Catteneo, Jaime Clark, Jason Kinser, Matt DeSantis, Liz White, Nishok Chitvel, Shelley Reid, Shun Ye, Krista Shires

Program Coordinator: Krista Shires

**Mason Core Committee Meetings were held on September 22, 2022 and October 20, 2022.**

During the September meeting, Debra Stroiney was elected co-chair for the 2022-2023 academic year. The taskforce for revisions to the capstone/synthesis will continue this academic year. They will meet to discuss feedback that provided last year when the revisions to this course were proposed to the faculty senate and university as a whole.

In the October meeting the committee discussed improving the application and review process for Mason Core proposals to make the process clearer for those submitting as well as the members who are reviewing. A brief discussion was held on developing a timeline for the roll out of the Just Society Attributes.

The following proposals were approved by the Mason Core in the September & October meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSL</td>
<td>GEOL 103: Physical Geology Lab (catalog error fix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSNL</td>
<td>GEO 101: Physical Geology (catalog error fix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSNL</td>
<td>GEO 102: Historical Geology (catalog error fix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>CULT 320: Globalization and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td>HDFS 499: Advanced internship and analysis in Human Development and Family Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>CS 108: Intro to Computer Programming, Part A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>GOVT 134: Grand Challenges to Human Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNTH</td>
<td>CHEM 460: Chemistry in the Kitchen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dependent Tuition Benefit

Dear fellow Patriots:

I am thrilled to share that the Mason Virginia Promise (MVP) is available to qualifying George Mason University employees in the form of Mason’s first-ever MVP Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit. This new program will begin for the Spring 2023 semester.

As you may recall, MVP is Mason’s program to provide opportunities for any Virginian who wants to attain a Mason college degree, and help Virginia entrepreneurs start or grow their businesses.

Today I am pleased to invite Mason employees whose family income is $60,000 or less, or whose dependents are eligible to receive a Pell Grant, to apply for this new employee benefit. It will ensure that qualifying employees receive sufficient grants and scholarships ("gift aid") to cover the full cost of tuition and mandatory fees, which currently equals $13,404 per year and $6,702 per semester.

The deadline to qualify for Spring 2023 is fast approaching. APPLY BY NOVEMBER 28, 2022. Employees wishing to apply for an MVP employee dependent grant must follow these steps:

1. Log into PatriotWeb
2. Select the “Employee Services” tab
3. Navigate to Employee Dashboard
4. Expand the Benefits section and click “Dependents”

To qualify, a student must:

- Be an undergraduate student and resident of Virginia
- Be a tax dependent of a current Mason benefits-eligible employee
- Be eligible for Virginia state grants and federal aid
- Report on their FAFSA form a family income of $60,000 or less, OR be Pell-eligible
- Have filed the 22-23 FAFSA or VASA by March 1, 2022
- Be enrolled full time at the end of the Spring 2023 drop (freeze) period

Building out the MVP program to fulfill this promise takes time and resources, and we are realizing this vision in steps. Over time, we hope to have the resources available to extend the MVP Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit to a broader range of Mason employees. As a start, we are giving first priority to those who demonstrate the greatest financial need.

If you have a dependent who is or may become enrolled at Mason, and you think you may qualify for this benefit, I encourage you to apply.

For more information, please visit: Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit Program.

Sincerely,
Gregory Washington
President
LIST OF ATTENDEES

109 Total Listed Attendees (48 Senators and 61 Visitors)
4 Additional Visitors attended who chose not to be listed


6 Senators absent: Alan Abramson, Meagan Call-Cummings, Richard Craig, Daniel Garrison, Lisa Lister, Kathleen Roberts.