BOARD OF VISITORS
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

Presidential Search Committee Meeting
December 6, 2019
MINUTES

PRESENT: Co-Chairs Shannon Davis and Jimmy Hazel; Denise Albanese, Simmi Bhuller, Horace Blackman, Terri Cofer Beime, Mehmood Kazmi, Camden Layton, Germaine Louis, Ignacia Moreno, Carolyn Moss, Jon Peterson, Lauren Reuscher, Edward Rice, Carole Scott, Girum Urgessa, Bob Witeck, and Lisa Zuccari; and Secretary pro tem Cagle.

ABSENT: Tom Davis

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES: Sharon Cullen, Ron Forehand, Jan Greenwood, Julie Holley, Deborah Love, and Lauren McCaghren.

I. Call to Order
Co-Chair Hazel called the meeting to order 8:02 a.m. and thanked the committee members for their attendance. He confirmed the Presidential Search Committee would meet again on December 13, 2019.

II. Approval of Minutes
Co-Chair Hazel called for any corrections to the minutes from the Presidential Search Committee Meeting of August 23, 2019, the Presidential Search Committee Listening Session for Students on September 3, 2019, and the Presidential Search Community Session on October 30, 2019.

Visitor Blackman MOVED approval of the minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Visitor Rice.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE

III. Appointment of the Announcement Subcommittee
Co-Chair Hazel announced the appointment of the following members of the Presidential Search Committee as an Announcement Subcommittee of the Presidential Search Committee:

1. Carolyn Moss
2. Edward Rice
3. Carole Scott
4. Germaine Louis

He stated that when it is time to begin interviewing candidates the only responsibility of the Announcement Subcommittee would be to meet publicly, pursuant to requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, to announce at the appropriate times that the Presidential Search Committee would be meeting at some undisclosed time and location within fifteen days of the
announcement, for the sole purpose of interviewing candidates for presidency of the University. Ms. Terri Cofer Beime MOVED approval of the Announcement Subcommittee of the Presidential Search Committee. The motion was SECONDED by Visitor Witeck.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE

IV. Co-Chairs Report

Co-Chair Hazel referenced the Presidential Search Community Session on October 30, 2019 and reported that there was a group of faculty members who believe the Presidential Search should be an open search and not a confidential search. Co-Chair Hazel stated there was not a required action by the Presidential Search Committee, but that the information was being provided to keep the Committee apprised. He advised that when and if there was action to be taken on that matter, it would be taken by the Board of Visitors, not by the Presidential Search Committee.

Co-Chair Davis referenced the materials from the Faculty Senate that were provided to each Committee member (Attachment 1). She explained that the materials were provided to the University community the previous day and that it was the result of two motions that passed through the Faculty Senate stating the Faculty Senate’s position on how the faculty would like to proceed with the Presidential Search. Co-Chair Davis further stated that this was her opportunity to bring to the Committee the thoughts and the will of the Faculty Senate as representatives of the general faculty at George Mason. She noted the front page (Attachment – page 1) was the final motion that listed the specific requests of the faculty with a rank ordered by vote of preferences in the ways in which the faculty are willing to accept engagement with the process. Co-Chair Davis reported that there would be no action taken on this matter by the Search Committee, but that as Faculty Senate Chair, she wanted to be sure the Search Committee and then the Board of Visitors were aware of the position of the faculty.

Co-Chair Hazel opened the floor for questions. Visitor Moreno requested time for further discussion on the issue of public or confidential nature of the Search. She noted that during the Presidential Search Community Session, and other discussions she had had with faculty, that there was strong sentiment on this issue and she wanted to make sure it was given due consideration. Co-Chair Hazel responded that the subject would be discussed at the Board of Visitors Meeting the following week (December 12, 2019).
Co-Chair Hazel reminded the Search Committee that they would be discussing actual applicants and that all members had signed the Code of Ethics document. He emphasized the importance of confidentiality and that it was extremely important to continue to be very careful about what is said outside of the Committee proceedings.

V. Closed Session

Co-Chair Davis MOVED that the Presidential Search Committee go into Closed Session pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711. A.1 to discuss personnel matters including assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining, or resignation of specific public officers, appointees or employees, and more specifically to discuss the evaluation of candidates for President of the University, which discussion may also involve evaluation and performance of departments or schools that will necessarily involve the discussion of specific employees; and Section 2.2-3711. A.8 for consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters, including the aforementioned issues, as well as other issues related to the presidential search. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Carole Scott.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE

Vice Rector Hazel announced that the Committee would reconvene in Open Session and take a roll call vote on certification that only public business matters lawfully exempted from Open Meeting requirements, and only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the meeting by the Presidential Search Committee. He further stated that any member of the Committee who believed that there was a departure from the requirements as stated above, should so state prior to the vote, indicating the substance of the departure that in his, or her, judgement, had taken place.

Roll call was taken with all present members responding in the affirmative.

Jan Greenwood, President and Partner of Greenwood/Asher and Associates, asked that all working papers from the Closed Session be submitted to her.
VI. Adjournment

With no other business matters to come before the Committee, Co-Chair Hazel adjourned the meeting at 12:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Cagle
Secretary pro tem

Attachment 1: Faculty Senate Statement on the Presidential Search Process (3 pages)
FACULTY SENATE STATEMENT ON THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCESS

With regard to the process of a search for a University president, the Faculty Handbook (Section 1.2.5) states, “The search and selection process must include opportunities for the General Faculty to meet with candidates who are finalists for the presidency.”

On November 6, 2019, the Faculty Senate passed a motion that calls for “...a public forum for each finalist where s/he is invited to give a presentation to include the General Faculty, as well as students and staff, followed by a question and answer period;” for “faculty, students and staff [to] be invited to submit feedback regarding each finalist to the search committee”; and for “this phase of the search ... [to] be of adequate duration to allow for the search committee’s consideration of such feedback.”

In line with the Faculty Handbook and with this motion, the Faculty Senate views the following as viable methods for meaningfully engaging faculty input in the search process:

1. Multiple finalists should engage in the process of meeting with faculty.
2. Each finalist should have a live (synchronous) meeting with the faculty – this meeting can be held in person and/or remotely.
3. All faculty who participate in a meeting with a finalist should be given an opportunity to provide feedback to the search committee, which the search committee would then incorporate into their final report and recommendations to the BOV.
4. The meeting would be held in one of the following formats, listed in order of preference:
   a. Finalists meet with faculty in a completely open meeting
   b. Faculty who participate in the meeting sign a ‘code of ethics’ similar to that used by the search committee, which includes a statement about respecting confidentiality of finalists.
   c. Live meeting is held in some way that hides the identity of the finalist (e.g., in the style of a “chat room”)
5. The meeting would be open to one of the following groups of faculty, listed in order of preference:
   a. Meeting is open to all general faculty (with option to participate remotely)
   b. Meeting is open to Faculty Senators only (in line with Section 1.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook that states, “The General Faculty delegates by Charter to the Faculty Senate the responsibility for shared academic governance at the university level.”)
   c. Meeting is open to a set number of general faculty on a “first-come, first-serve” basis, with no option to participate remotely
6. The meeting will include a presentation to the faculty, followed by a Q&A session that is run in one of the following ways, listed in order of preference:
   a. Open Q&A session after the presentation, where any faculty can ask questions on a “first-come, first-serve” basis
   b. Engage in a “question development” process, whereby a set of questions is selected and then asked by faculty representative(s) on the Search Committee (or another appropriate faculty representative)

---

1 The motion to endorse this statement was passed by Faculty Senate ballot vote on 12/4/19, 22 – 18.
2 See Appendix A for the full motion.
3 Order of preference determined by Faculty Senate ballot vote on 12/4/19. See Appendix B for specific vote tally.
4 Order of preference determined by Faculty Senate ballot vote on 12/4/19. See Appendix B for specific vote tally.
5 Order of preference determined by Faculty Senate ballot vote on 12/4/19. See Appendix B for specific vote tally.
APPENDIX A
RESOLUTION ON PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCESS

Whereas, the George Mason University Faculty Handbook (provision 1.2.5), states, “The Board of Visitors provides for participation on presidential search committees by faculty who are elected by the General Faculty;”

And, whereas the George Mason University Faculty Handbook states, “The search and selection process must include opportunities for the General Faculty to meet with candidates who are finalists for the presidency;”

And, whereas “The George Mason University Faculty Handbook defines and describes the conditions of full-time instructional, research, and clinical faculty employment; the structures and processes through which the faculty participates in institutional decision-making and governance;”

Now, therefore be it resolved that the George Mason University Faculty Senate calls for a search process consistent with the requirements of the Faculty Handbook to include a public forum for each finalist where s/he is invited to give a presentation to include the General Faculty as well as students and staff followed by a question and answer period;

And, be it further resolved that faculty, students and staff be invited to submit feedback regarding each finalist to the search committee;

And, be it further resolved that this phase of the search should be of adequate duration to allow for the search committee’s consideration of such feedback.

---

6 This motion was passed by Faculty Senate ballot vote on 11/6/19, 29-12.
APPENDIX B
PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE – FACULTY MEETING OPTIONS BALLOT VOTE TALLY

Total Number of Ballots = 39
Majority (50%) = 20

Open/Confidential Meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting is completely open</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty participants sign code of ethics including maintaining confidentiality of finalists</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalist identity is hidden (e.g., chat room)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All general faculty, with remote option to accommodate all who want to attend</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All general faculty, on “first-come, first-serve” basis, with no remote option</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senators, as representative of general faculty (per FH Section 1.3.1)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Style of Q&A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open to faculty participants on “first-come, first-serve” basis</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Question development” process to arrive at set of questions, which are then asked by a faculty representative (e.g., one of the faculty representatives to the Search Committee)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Not all ballots had rankings for each option.