WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
March 19, 2020

To: The WPI Faculty
From: Tanja Dominko
Secretary of the Faculty

The seventh Faculty meeting of the 2019-2020 academic year will be held on **Thursday, March 19, 2020 at 3:15 pm via ZOOM**.

1. Call to Order   T. Dominko
2. Committee Business
    Motion 1. Motion to allow remote voting at faculty meetings
      until the start of AY2021   G. Gaudette
    Motion 2. Motion to allow faculty governance to vote on behalf of the
      faculty if a faculty meeting cannot be called until the start of
      AY2021   G. Gaudette

3. Approval of the Agenda
    Approval of the Consent Agenda and the Minutes from 2-13-20   T. Dominko

2. SoF's Report   T. Dominko

3. President's Report   L. Leshin

4. Provost's Report   W. Soboyejo

5. Committee Business – cont'd
    a. Committee on Governance
    Motion to endorse formation of Aerospace Department   G. Gaudette/ N. Gatsonis

    b. Committee on Academic Policy and the Committee on Academic Operations
    Motion to modify Commencement Policy   G. Heineman/ P. Mathisen

    c. Committee on Governance and the Committee on Appointments and Promotion

    Three motions to modify the language in the Faculty Handbook concerning sabbatical
    leaves   G. Gaudette/ P. Weathers

    Motion to modify the language in the Faculty Handbook concerning feedback to candidates
    who have been denied promotion   G. Gaudette/ P. Weathers

6. New Business
7. Closing Announcements
8. Adjournment

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Faculty Meeting Materials, March 19, 2020

Page

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
Faculty Meeting Minutes
February 13, 2020

Summary:
1. Call to Order
2. President's Report
3. Provost's Report
4. Other Reports: Update on WPI Forward
5. Adjournment

Detail:

1. Call to Order

The sixth Faculty meeting of the 2019-2020 academic year was called to order at 3:20pm in Olin Hall 107 by **Prof. Dominko (BBT).** The agenda and consent agenda (including the minutes from the January 16, 2020 Faculty meeting) were approved. She reminded everyone that the meeting is being recorded, for accuracy purposes.

2. President's Report

President Leshin reported that the Board of Trustees will hold the February Board meeting next week, and she thanked The Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom and The Committee on Appointments and Promotions for all their work and recommendations on this year's candidates. She reported that the Board will be voting on those tenure and promotion cases, along with discussions on the new building, a new residence hall, building updates (Kaven, Harrington and Higgins House, which are part of the Capital Plan. She announced that the annual celebration of Faculty Achievement will be held on Thursday evening. President Leshin gave a brief update on the class of 2024, which includes 11,300 applicants (10% who are confirmed) and over 3,000 women in the pool. She announced that she will be leaving the meeting at 4:30 to travel to Washington DC, to speak on a panel of the AAAS.

3. Provost's Report

Provost Soboyejo wished everyone a belated Happy New Year. He spoke about how he spent his holiday vacation, by reviewing tenure and promotion files, and how that was a wonderful opportunity to discover the talent and richness that we have at WPI, the academic and scholarly talent, the teaching methods, student support, and commitment by faculty members to this community. He stated that the processes we go through, and the ways we address issues matter, The Provost reflected on what a privilege it is to serve on Management Council, and to work with professionals across multiple fields to make this a truly great place. The Provost spoke about the experts in Finance, Law and Management who truly know what they are doing and that it takes these people to make WPI truly successful. WPI is a 270 million dollar Corporation, run by professionals who really know what they do, and we must respect that. Academics work together with the professionals as a team, and that is what makes WPI special. The Provost spoke about the Facilities workers who get the campus looking great by the time we all come to work, and that we may take that for granted, but that he expresses his thanks to each and every one of these people that make this a truly beautiful place. He spoke about the Board members who roll their sleeves up and really want to work, their commitment, and their willingness to

give anonymously and want no praise in return. The Provost spoke of his interactions with COG colleagues and the Deans, and that sometimes there are arguments, but in the end everyone comes together to do what is best for WPI. The Provost shared his thoughts on WPI Forward, as a case of a Family with each and every one of us as a member, looking at the finances, as you do in a Family, and say at times that you have to tighten your belts a little sometimes and be a little more efficient…which doesn't mean there is a crisis, because this is not a crisis, it's a case where we all have to give a little to make sure that we're more sustainable in the future. He went on to say that WPI is a great place, will continue to invest in the future, will continue to grow, and that there is a special demand for our own special brand of education. We need to continue to innovate, we have opportunities with the online space, grow in research so we won't lose our teaching identity, and all of us need to work with mutual trust, knowing that we all love WPI. So, like most Families we argue, but that doesn't mean that we can't agree, and in the end must come to a consensus. The Provost asked, as we listen today to professionals present their work and, ultimately, when we connect to this, and we own some of these concepts that he has presented, he believes that, as we go through the deliberations today, we should listen carefully and accept that we are not the experts in everything, though we work together for the collective good of WPI, In his opinion, if we do all of these things, and we have the next strategic vision/plan, this will continue to be, for him, the best University in the heart of New England.

Prof. Dominko reminded everyone, for today's discussion on WPI Forward, to:
- Limit questions and comments to 2 minutes
- Individuals will be called on once, so that everyone has a chance to participate, then if requested, be called on again
- Do not interrupt anyone speaking
- To not speak unless you are recognized on the floor
- Identify yourself before speaking

4. Other Reports: Update on WPI Forward
President Leshin reflected on last year being a hard year, and remembered thinking how we came through some very difficult discussions, conversations, challenging times thinking that it would be great to not have to go through something really hard this year. Then, there was a signal from the incoming students, which told us that we need to do something really hard, and that's what this is. She reflected on her values and how those values drive her: taking responsibility, always trying to see the good in others and standing up for what she believes is right. Those values still guide her today, and through a difficult process, she realizes that this community is stressed, hurting, scared, suspicious, and that the level of trust is not at an all-time high, and perhaps it is at an all-time low. She comes back to the things that unite everyone, which Provost Soboyejo spoke so eloquently about…care for our students, making sure that WPI is able to deliver on the educational promise that is made to families; and treating our community with care and respect. Those are the things that she holds front and center as we move through this difficult discussion. Therefore, this presentation update is a dense version so people could start to digest this information and see where things are headed. Her hopes today are to hit the highlights and to specifically focus on questions and listening (through the Steering Committee and interactions in the community) and the adaptation of the process guided by those questions and interactions. She will be addressing why some of this information is changing, and how we will go about trying to close the gap, being as transparent as we can reasonably be, while still

pretty early in this process, and try to share with everyone a date when decisions will be made. The President stated that, as much as she would like to say that this is a one-time thing, we are living in a challenging moment, and we as an institution need to get more responsive to that moment, need to build some muscle at predicting the future, getting better at responding to it. She stated that this presentation would share what the committee is looking at, and things that the committee is not looking at for changes.

She stated that some of the slides will look familiar from past town meetings or faculty meetings, for increasing the affordability and accessibility of WPI to families, especially in context with our nearest peers and competitors. This is about families comparing two offer letters and finding that WPI isn't as competitive as we need to be in a rapidly changing market. It's also about investing in graduate aid, TA's and tuition waivers, which is also part of the gap that you'll hear about at today's presentation; and acknowledging that the landscape of higher education is more dynamic than it's ever been. With more cushion in our budget, we can manage those ups and downs a bit better.

The President stated that right now the current target for next year's budget that we need to close through this process is about 8 million dollars. That is a lower number than what you've heard previously, which will be reconciled, but she stressed that this is not a final number. Many factors go into this, and we do not have next year's graduate student class in yet. She also stressed that this is much more than about closing a one-year budget gap, it's about building muscle, and how we can do things effectively for our community and students; and to do so in a way in which it is consistent with our values of transparency, inclusion and caring for people.

The President spoke about the very rapid shift in the market, and how quickly we have seen this in undergraduate and graduate enrollment, aid demands, indicating a very competitive market. She stated that the data of peer institution enrollment had not been studied and that it is fair for people to be upset about this. She continued that, in fairness, the data is always a couple of years older when we get it, we knew that price pressure was likely, when the five-year institutional budget plan was passed a year ago, we knew that the single biggest unaddressed risk in that plan was, would we be able to bring in the classes at the discount rate we were planning. The market told us pretty quickly that we undervalued that risk. She stated that they should have bitten the bullet and incorporated that risk in the budget in the first place, and that is a lot of what we're here talking about today. She explained the problem as not a sticker price problem but a net price problem, after aid, cost of room, board and tuition for first year students vs. our peers. She explained that all information would have to be examined before any decisions were made. Normally the Board approved the upcoming salary pool at the February meeting and the full budget proposal in May, however they will be proposing to the Board to wait, give themselves as much time as possible to get as much information as possible, to think hard about the whole system. What was proposed to the Steering Committee, which they were in favor of, was to hold all the studies, look, examine and take all that data and try to get integrated recommendations for next year's budget in May, and bring it to the Board for approval in early June. The President acknowledges that, at the end of the process, she is the one who must make the hard call and make the decisions. The hope is to examine all the data together, and gather input and ideas from everyone, and she thinks this is totally manageable. She announced that if anyone is interested in participating on a team, to let the committee know.

V.P. Solomon thanked the Steering Committee, and especially Profs. Johnson, Radzicki and Dominko for their considerable amount of time. He stated that it was a good exercise for everyone to get on the same page. He explained that the budget submitted to the Board in February 2019 did not work due to the market dictating that the aid given to students was too low. A revised budget was submitted in October 2019, taking into consideration higher financial aid, and insights on graduate credit delivery on campus, plus other variabilities, a slightly higher contingency was brought to the Board to produce this WPI Forward target. Subsequently, the team is looking at all of the information for the current budget; refine that information, which shows a projected need for $8 million instead of $10 million. He spoke about one of the power point slides which shows that information of less revenue/more expense. V.P. Solomon explained that there is positivity on investments in research-based projects and increases in indirect cost recovery. He stated that there was also success in the bond market. When the February 2019 model was produced, the end result was a surplus of about $4.5 million. The bottom line, he explained, was that we had about $13 million worth of things that got worse, about $5 million of things that improved, resulting in the target of $8 million (which is the current target and will continue to be refined). He spoke about the four year average tuition discount rate, which we had been modelling at 41%, and went up to 44%, not knowing what this year's class would look like, and keeping it at 43% for ongoing budgets. One thing Prof. Dominko has challenged the administration to do, is to make sure everyone reconciles graduate credit hours; that there are some reports on credit delivery; and he wants to make sure everyone feels good, on the steering committee and on FAP, that we are able to reconcile those numbers back into our budget modelling. He stated that he feels confident that we have all those pieces, and he wants to make sure that Prof. Dominko and others feel just as confident.

President Leshin stated that it was important to point out the TBD column, since some things are still uncertain, and suggested that V.P. Solomon speak about the Board being less comfortable with certain things. He spoke of different variables affecting the budget; credit hours, price increases, salary pool, deferred maintenance funding and contingency.

V.P. Morton pointed out the pile of decks of this information at the front table, for people to take and peruse at their leisure. She spoke about the list of factors that when examining any project on the list to be looked at, stated that they do not want to do anything to mess up the distinctive education that WPI offers and that it is critical that we maintain and protect that. She explained that, through the powerpoint presentation, they are trying to minimize the impact on people, trying to figure out savings in non-people areas. She spoke about the projects, which are chunked: Strategic Sourcing (which includes contracts with vendors; bulk purchasing; policies with purchasing, MRO -- maintenance, repair and operating supplies, and travel). The question is, is there a way to save in these areas without having a direct impact on peoples' livelihoods. The gray area, the three areas that are being explored: mobile device policy; events that are a couple hundred thousand dollars or more, and whether they can be collapsed, or if they have to happen every year, is there overlap with sponsorship. External marketing, external professional services. Organizational structure; whether or not the organizational structure is serving WPI in the best way possible. This includes student employment levels, however they have been very clear with Huron that we can't just "pull the plug" on a lot of students, since they are driving a lot of what happens around here, so that won't happen. It's more of a "scalpel" than a "hammer"

approach. Faculty supplemental pay/Faculty Load; this is about understanding what is in-load and out-of-load, benchmarking around that, are the right things in and out of load. Half of the supplemental pay is out-of-load classes equaling 1.7 million dollars. Comp and benefits; merit increases, 403B contribution, which is currently 11% (11 million dollars, 1 million per percentage point), benchmarking shows the median at 8%. She stated that these areas are being examined, but that no decisions have been made. She then spoke about areas that are not being looked at to be taken away: tuition exchange benefits, there will be no charges for parking, no charges for sports and rec center access, they will not be pulling the plug on the free vacation week at the holiday season, and they are not saying to every division/department head that they need to cut 5% in their operations, and to submit your list by the end of the month, they are not saying any of this. They are trying to be very thoughtful and transparent about this process.

President Leshin stated that the hope was not to cut at all, but to actually leverage things like vacancies or retirements to manage any needed changes. Counted the savings for: did a re-org at the beginning of the year, she hears that there have been conversations on the campus about executive compensation. One of the important things to think about here is to make sure our pain is shared across the organization, and making sure we're protecting those that are the lowest paid and probably asking people that are the best paid to take more of the pain. Without giving anyone a ton of detail, she stated, that is what this is. We are already doing that, we have reduced expenses from the top layer of administration for next year's budget by multiple tens of percent, between the re-org and pay/compensation changes. So, just to be clear, the leadership of this institution will be taking pay-cuts as part of this. She stated that she's unsure if someone is going to stand up and talk about this, but she thought she would get that out there now. This has to be ratified by the Board, since they have to make sure that the good leaders here are appropriately compensated. So this is a decision that she hopes the Board will support her in making.

V. P. Morton stated that the Project Teams find the information, give it to the Steering Committee, who advise the President, and the President will decide, that is basically how it goes.

Prof. Spanagel (HUA) spoke about the first set of information provided by V.P. Solomon, appreciates his thoughts that he has since shared, and appreciates President Leshin's remarks about being proactive. He stated that it's not just about the piece of executive compensation may play in the bottom line, he wished to observe the concern he has with having different compensation philosophies offering across the institution. If there is a Board designated salary pool with increases that govern us, most of the compensation decisions made are by department heads, whether that be a 1% or 2% raise. What may sound idealistic or unreasonable, but in fact, hundreds and hundreds of people across this campus will spend their whole career here, be very successful, innovative, and very hard working in spite of the fact that that is the only raise they can look forward to year after year. He stated that it is appreciated that the Board is exercising financial diligence on behalf of the health of the institution, however the concern is, if a different compensation philosophy applies to a certain number of individuals, there is a different assumption about where trust, loyalty and commitment to what it is we're all here for is placed. He stated that he is worried that it puts our VP's and the President in a very uncomfortable and vulnerable position, if they have levels of escalating compensation, that they would only be

doing these jobs because they are being so well compensated. He stated that this is a hard thing to say, but that he does not want them to be in this position and price themselves out of our ability to keep them here.

President Leshin thanked Prof. Spanagel and stated that she agrees with him. Prof. Spanagel volunteered to sit on the Board for deciding compensation; however President Leshin stated that Executive compensation is firmly up to the Board of Trustees. She also stated that she thinks it is fair and that she personally gave her entire raise back to WPI last year as a gift. She also stated that there are portions of Executive 990's that are counted twice (i.e. two different years), and that it is difficult to disentangle what is real, so urged everyone not to get too attached to any numbers there, but that the Board is looking at the detail and reality. The President thanked Prof. Spanagel for taking what had the potential of being a really nasty conversation and turning it into a thoughtful one, and appreciates it.

Prof. Humi (MA) asked for clarification about WPI needing to make the decision on the incoming freshman class by May 1. V.P. Morton stated that most of the class has been admitted, with exception of the RD students, who have to decide on WPI by May 1. Prof. Humi asked if the discount has already been made to those students. V.P. Morton stated that you offer it to the larger swath, who accept your offer, so WPI is watching every day the running discount rate to see if the people are picking up the offer that have a higher or lower discount rate. President Leshin stated that last year's class came in at 44% and it was decided that this year would be 44% as well. She stated that they tried to bring them in at 41%, but WPI scraped, scattered and saved to being them in at 44%. V.P. Solomon stated that the 44% was a big piece of the $4 million.

Prof. El-Korchi (CEE) asked what if the $8, $10, $12 million dollar number turns into $20, $25 million, perhaps for the next four or five years, and stated that it is a question of confidence. He went on to say that we've been hiring administrators and giving support to Deans and the Provost, and confidence needs to be given from the Administration and the Board of Trustees, who are actually watching the purse strings. President Leshin apologized for interrupting and stated that there have been many TTT Faculty hirings as well. She stated that this is a longer-term question. The short-term question is the $8 vs $10 million is what is being discussed today. The longer-term question is about the question of confidence and how we get better at that. The five-year institutional model that has been built is a first for this intuition. She stated that they are new at trying to get better at planning she couldn't agree more that they need to figure out how to increase the resilience of our processes and increase our resilience in changes in the outside market, which is hard to do at a time when the market is changing quickly, but that she 100% agrees with the concern and is absolutely top of mind for her. She is concerned that so much time is being spend on focusing on whether it is $8 or $10 million, and asked to be held accountable and questioned throughout the process of building long-term resilience into the budget. She accepts that individuals have concerns and that confidence is shaken.

Trustee Andy Aberdale (BOT) thanked Prof. Spanagel and stated that he would bring his comments/concerns back to the Board. Trustee Aberdale responded to Prof. El-Korchi, and stated that he didn't blame him for saying that confidence could be shaken, because perhaps the Boards confidence is slightly shaken. When the Board looked at the 5-year model for the first

time about a year ago, they thought it was smooth sailing. Then the class of 2022 came in, then the class of 2023 came in, and they noticed how these variables can change…one of twenty variables, namely the variable of the discount rate, which is focused, and over-focused on. We don't focus on maintenance, nor the cost of capital (which Jeff works so hard to keep low), so there are all these other variables that we have to understand the sensitivity on, and that the model we have is a simple P & L balance sheet/cash flow sheet with, he thinks, all the right inputs. He stated that as we get better at producing the WPI 5-year rolling model, in the ideal world, each variable is taken and we collectively go deep into these variables to understand them and hopefully we can all decide what is the right number to use. These are assumptions until they are locked down. He stated that on Monday, the Steering Committee and the Trustees held a meeting, where the Trustees were very aggressive on not spending too much time wasted on the discussion of $8 vs $10 million, and moreover thinking about the long-term solution. He assures the Board members that he works with a few people on campus (Administration and Faculty) and consistently hear the same message, with the same end point.

Prof. Rudolph (HUA) stated that we can all agree that the students are the highest priority here at WPI, and that over the past years WPI has done a great job raising scholarship money for our students. She asked what percentage of that money raised has gone to offset the operating budget instead, and is that why we're in this? President Leshin stated that WPI has an amount budgeted for institutional aid (actual dollars that make up the discount rate), with a pretty small fraction of those dollars from gifts ($9 million out of $107 million [10%]), so we need to raise a heck of a lot more, especially in endowment, in order to offset this challenge without tapping into the operating budget. Prof. Rudolph asked what percentage is used to offset the operating budget of the gift money. President Leshin stated that all of the scholarship money, given as gifts, we draw from the endowment and we use for scholarships, 100%, with whatever else is needed to get to that 44%, comes out of the operating budget. V.P. Solomon looks at it like: how much aid are we giving out and what do we have for resources to support it. When looking at the endowment draw, he would assume that is a revenue source, when looking at how much aid is being given out, he would assume that as a reduction of revenue. So, in fact, we're looking at the total amount of aid, and considering the total amount of resources available to the institution to cover that; the difference being this unrestricted, unfunded amount. President Leshin stated that every dollar is being used for its intended purpose.

Prof. Gericke (CBC) brought up the salary pool and encouraged the Administration to look at the mix of base merit vs. extra merit. He explained that we have had 4-5 years of 1% base and 2% of extra merit. The problem is, particularly for the staff members, 1% (considering inflation) is not a salary increase with added increases in health care, which hollows out the whole idea of extra merit. President Leshin agreed. V.P. Solomon stated that this was being examined through the project under the salary pool. President Leshin also stated that if they see a surplus above the budgeted line of the budget ($1 million), she would like to go the Board and ask for a one-time bonus to everyone to return some of the university's positive result in a tough year. She doesn't know if we'll get there, but if we have to take some toughness on the merit, she would like to try to figure out other ways to invest.

Prof. Sanbonmatsu (HUA, President of the WPI AAUP Chapter) spoke about some of the concerns that were brought up at the last AAUP meeting. In regards to the Steering Committee

process, there are 13 members, only 3 of which are Faculty Members, membership excludes the Dean of Arts & Sciences and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and membership includes a former SGA President. There is concern about the timeline of the decision-making, being that it will be at the start of summer, and Faculty may not be available to properly react of express an opinion at that stage. Finally, he spoke about the elephant in the room, the second bullet point stating "Careful examination of our spending is something we do not have deep experience in". He stated that this was shocking to a lot of people to hear, since we have been assuming, since many departments have been penny-pinching and not getting increases yearly, in fact, we're losing purchasing power, which brings us to the question of confidence. He also stated they would be happy to submit other questions as well. President Leshin welcomed other questions. Prof. Dominko asked for one of the presenters to address the "careful examination" statement. President Leshin stated that she wrote that. Prof. Dominko asked if she agreed that it was of concern. President Leshin stated yes, but the whole point is to look at the list of projects, and that we have not looked at our administrative structure, and haven't been willing to ask ourselves hard questions about the fact that we have 27 different kinds of supplemental pay. She stated that there are all different kinds of things that we could be looking at as an institution that we haven't been, so the idea is that we need to try and get better at this. V.P. Solomon stated that we have approached our annual budget process in much more of an incremental budgeting approach, whereby some modeling is run and we say, here's how much money we think we have available, go through the APBP process, award out millions of dollars of new items that we want to find from all different things. With respect to the "careful examination of spending", we are not doing a zero-base budget approach, (i.e. the Humanities budget), which was not built from the bottom up, rather adding on to it every year as a legacy budget. He stated that what we're doing here is taking a different look, pausing on the incremental spending, looking at how we can right-size the institution, and try to figure out how are there structural deficits that need to be fixed, possibly with some money reallocated.

Prof. deWinter (HUA) was wondering why there are so many efforts to save money and also so many meetings to increase revenue, but none of the issues are being reconciled. President Leshin responded by saying that this is part of the short term and long term. Revenue opportunities are on the table, but it is hard to use this to solve the short term problem. If we can see our way to being confident in revenue opportunities, these can start to play in because they are important. They are being forgotten about even though they are critical.

Prof. Sakulich (CEE) questioned the validity of limiting factors of enrollment, which include: negative public perception of the value of higher education, lack of willingness to take on debt, and increasing competition. He questioned how there are a record number of applicants this year despite these factors.
President Leshin replied by stating that we worked the market harder than we ever have before. V.P. Solomon added that more financial aid is being given to attract these students. He also stated that there is competition from competitors that were never on their list such as UMass. These institutions have invested in STEM education because it is a market that has seen recent growth. These institutions have a lower cost of attendance, but arguably also have a lower value of education. This is why more financial aid was needed to attract more students. President Leshin stated that we could lower the financial aid and accept all students, but institutions that typically get into trouble are those that follow this with 85% acceptance rates. Currently, WPI

has just below a 50% acceptance rate. There is some room for improvement, but a larger number of applications helps bring in classes at a certain discipline range.

Prof. Higgins (HUA) is worried about pressure to increase faculty workload. There is an inverse relation between the workload and quality of education. Many faculty members are already working at capacity. There is a danger with the fact that that all courses are capped at certain levels for good reason. She is concerned with the formulas that will be used to determine these things. She requested more transparency and input from both faculty and department heads regarding how these decisions are made.

President Leshin assured Prof. Higgins that this is what they are planning to do. She said that that is the point in taking the time to really study this and understand it in order to avoid a one-size fits all solution. She stated that this is the purpose of having faculty on these committees. They are present to check to ensure that the richness and diversity of the place are preserved.

Prof. Richman (ME) asked about the use of the money saved through WPI Forward. He stated that this value was originally for financial aid and was proposed at $10 million, but has been shifted to $8 million. Only $4 million of this new value is designated to financial aid with the other $4 million being related to shortfalls and graduate tuition. Not only has the numerical value shifted, but also the purpose of the money. This shows that graduation education is in the same crisis. His second concern was about how the $4 million value was generated. The gap in the figure shown indicates a need for $4,000 to $8,000 per student, which would mean $20 million in financial aid. He asked if we are looking to save $4 million every year. If not, how are we going to close this gap?

V.P. Solomon said that this related to building a long term sustainable financial model for WPI. Initially, shifting from a 41% discount rate to 44% generated a $7 million increase in financial aid need. After getting a better sense of the bottom up and what other classes have been awarded, this number dropped to $4 million. The longer term issue relates to the competitiveness of the environment that we are in. If peers are continuing to discount rates to attract students, the discount rate used by WPI will need to be reevaluated. A large portion of this relates to the fundamental value of private education and if we can compete longer term. It is hard for private universities to compete pricewise with public universities.

Motion to extend meeting for 15 minutes was approved.

Prof. Cowlagi (ME) asked if we are running under the assumption that the administration staffing level is as optimal as it can be. V.P. Solomon said that the span of control optimization focuses at the supervisor level in terms of ratios of supervisors to employees and the layers that separate employees from the next level of leadership. This data can be examined to see where we stack up in order to fully understand role of supervisors. Administrative staffing optimization is looking at administrative support across departments to understand what administrative assistants are doing and if there are areas that are over allocated or don't have enough support. The goal is to get the right size support that the institution needs.

Prof. Gaudette (BE) disagreed with the statement that nobody has been asking these hard questions. He stated that faculty has been asking them for years. In FAP, Prof. Dominko asked about spending on administration. COG has also explored the roles and responsibilities of deans.

These questions on spending have been being asked. Confidence has been alluded to, but he has serious concerns. He stated that pushing the date back to May is asking for confidence from the faculty and if their voice is requested, it should not be pushed back.

Prof. Eddy (HUA) asked a question from those that don't have tenure. The question was: will these plan cuts affect the current NTT road to tenure that we are debating? If this is going to be affected, how will it be affected? She also asked her own question about the meaning of reclassifying open positions. She wanted to know if it signals creating fewer tenure track lines. She also inquired about the academic impact of doing that? Are we even going to access the academic impact of doing that? Her last comment was that the span of control optimization was Orwellian language. V.P. Morton stated that none of this is related to faculty. She also stated that the NTT and TTT pathway have not been mentioned. V.P. Solomon stated that the numbers in the 5 year plan are still there. The conversation that we need to have will be if we can continue on the same path at the same pace. Next year is year 3 in the 5 year plan, so we need to understand what is going on in the faculty loading model. Nobody is proposing any cuts in any of the changes. Based on the analysis, there could be some recommendations. Open positions could be used to move those in positions that could be eliminated. There are other ways to achieve target savings. Some options that he mentioned are early retirement of staff or not filling open positions. He has been working with V.P. Jones-Johnson and her team on this.

V.P. Michelle Jones Johnson (Talent & Inclusion/Chief Diversity Officer) stated that part of the issue is that span of control is not a term that is used. Staffing levels are being examined. She asked how many levels between staffing members is being explored and are there people who manage one person versus people who manage 3 or 4 people. She stated that this is new to WPI and there is no insight into any of this. We have to get the data on how each department is organized and what their specific goals are. This can help create recommendations in terms of optimizing the structure of departments. The goal is to look at it in the third person and come back to make recommendations.

Provost Soboyejo stated that this current fiscal year is one of the first years that we have budgeted the non-tenure track faculty in a clear way. They are now exploring the effects of a fraction of them becoming TTT faculty. What is a process that we can build this tenure track faculty that is fully budgeted? Those that joined this year can advance to tenure within a 5 year period. Every year we can make a set number of slots available according to the budget. This will allow for a sustainable tenure track path. One goal that Provost Soboyejo explained is building a real budget to have 1, 3, and 5 year contracts that are based on well-defined criteria. The current question is how to budget this in a way that would address some of the issues and there is currently a task force that is exploring this. Resigned people will be replaced, but the total population and budget are maintained and managed.

Prof. DiMassa (HUA) mentioned how much information still needs to be gathered and is unknown. He referenced the different task forces, but wanted to know what the responsibilities of these project groups and the consulting group are. He also wanted to know what the input and agency of these groups are.
V.P. Morton mentioned that the consulting group developed tools, project plans and a charter for each of the teams. They all have a project sponsor, which is either President Leshin or a direct

report of hers. They also all have two co-leads. The teams are working, gathering, benchmarking and doing all the work in order to come up with recommendations to the steering committee. The consulting group is dealing with the span of control work. They are gathering all the data around it since it is all very confidential. Relating to the work that the WPI teams are doing, all of them are using the same format and processes. Teams are gathering the information to discuss and recommend to President Leshin.

Prof. Elmes (FBS) asked if the faculty members could see who is on the teams mentioned above.
V.P. Morton said that there is a website that will be posted that contains this information. V.P. Solomon added that there are a few openings on these teams and requested more involvement.

Prof. Weathers (BBT) asked if faculty members could be notified where those openings are on the teams. V.P. Morton said that it is unlikely that they would deny people from joining the teams. She also assured everyone that these spots will be made public.

Prof. Moncrief (HUA) stated that the product we are providing is outstanding education for these students that we are trying to recruit. The way that we do that is having world class faculty that are researchers, scholars, and teachers. She is particularly concerned about recruiting and retention due to the potential cutting of benefits for retirement, increased health costs, stagnant salary pool. She is new to WPI and feels like this is a big switch from those attractive things that drew people to WPI. As a Department Head, she feels concerned about recruiting and maintaining excellent faculty. The question becomes how to look attractive in a competitive marketplace in order to ensure that the top-notch people are coming to WPI. WPI does not exist without faculty. She stated that our return on investment depends on the faculty. Currently, we are netting more indirect costs from our research, which is done by faculty. She asked how we plan to recruit and maintain these faculty members with a stagnant salary pool, potential increased health care costs, and potential decrease in benefits. V.P. Morton said this is why the decision is being delayed until all information is gathered from the possible areas of savings. That way we don't just go to the jugular of all the things that kick people in the teeth in terms of their benefits, salaries, and health insurance. That is why we don't know the answer regarding the salary pool, retirement contribution, or health benefits. She stated that we want to find out how to take away from the non-people related costs.

Prof. Rudolph (HUA) stated that there has been a lot of talk about salaries, but would like to know how much we are looking at the bigger costs that are not associated with educational aspects. An example of this is Boston Seaport. It is a huge cost and does not seem to have a large return on the education vision. Three in-house counsels have also been hired recently, but have the out of house legal fees been reduced? She stated that she believes that there are still significant legal fees outside of these employees.
V.P. Morton assured her that these are all being looked at along with all of the leases held by WPI.
V.P. Solomon added that professional services is one of the items on the list that is being evaluated. He added that one of the leases at 85 Prescott has just been canceled. Some of the peripheral properties are also being looked at. The administrative costs are being examined to see if there are adjustments that could be made.

Prof. Douglas (SSPS) said that she has heard a lot of anxiety about both faculty and administrative assistants and supports. She was wondering if it is true that everyone across campus can get involved including staff. V.P**.** Solomon stated that the goal is to have at least one faculty member on each team, but there are also going to be staff members. V.P. Morton stated that the list of committees will be emailed to the campus community.

Prof. Richman (ME) stated that these questions that arise have parallels in Faculty Governance. He asked if anyone has consulted with the Fringe Benefits Committee (FBC). He also asked, with respect to the faculty load, if there has been any effort to reach out to Faculty Governance to develop this information. V.P. Solomon stated that they are currently working on consulting with the FBC. He also stated that there has not been any work done with respect to the faculty load.

8. Adjournment
Meeting was adjourned at 4:40pm by **Prof. Dominko**.

Respectfully submitted,

Tanja Dominko
Secretary of the Faculty

Addenda on file with these minutes:
1. Addendum #1 WPI Forward Update – February 13, 2020

Consent Agenda Motions

CAO Drop CE 3024
CAO Add HU 2910
CAO Add GOV2318
CAO Add FP 4000
CAO Add a Minor in Financial Technology (FinTech)

CGSR Change RBE/ME 521

Date: March 19, 2020
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mathison, Chair)
Re: Motion to drop CE 3024 Control Surveying, approved by Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering on 2/4/2020

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends and I move, that CE 3024 Control Surveying be removed from the undergraduate catalog.

Rationale: This category II course has been rarely offered, and has had very low populations when it has been offered. The course was not offered in the 2015-16, 2016-17, or 2017-18 academic years. In A term 2018, the course had a population of 3, and it has not been offered since. The course content is outdated, and the department does not have a full-time faculty member to update or teach the course. The course is not required for a CE degree. Students are required to complete two laboratory courses, and there are 4 laboratory courses besides this course offered in the department; therefore, students have sufficient choices for laboratories. The removal of this course was approved at the faculty meeting of the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department on 2/4/2020.

Course description:
CE 3024. CONTROL SURVEYING. Cat. II This course presents the principles and field procedures required in the design of vertical and horizontal control networks for large building and construction projects. Recommended background: CE 2020. This course will be offered in 2018-19, and in alternating years thereafter.

Note changes to catalog:
Course will be removed from listing of laboratory courses in the distribution requirements for the CE degree.

Impact on Distribution Requirements and Other Courses: There is no impact on other degree programs. The course is not recommended or suggested background for any other courses within or outside of the CE department.

What term is this course typically offered and is it Cat. I or Cat. II?
The course is Category II, and was last offered in A term 2018.

If there is a course to replace this, which one?
There is no replacement course.

Note if there are any changes to resource requirements.
Deletion of this course will reduce the need to hire an adjunct to teach the course.

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2020-2021 Academic year.

Date: March 19, 2020
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mathison, Chair)
Re: Motion to add HU 2910 Project Center Experiential Learning approved by Department of Humanities and Arts on 12/06/2019

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends and I move that HU2910 Project Center Experiential Learning as described below, be added.

Course/Catalog Description:
HU2910 Project Center Experiential Learning
1/3 credit. Cat III.
This course will provide students participating in a HUA Project Center with a framework for investigating a particular cultural site, and to define a unique set of humanities and arts learning goals through experiential learning. Experiential learning means learning from experience or learning by doing. Experiential education immerses learners in an experience and then encourages reflection about the experience to develop new skills, new attitudes, or new ways of thinking. This course is structured in a self-directed manner in which students select a humanities/arts topic or theme, explore and experience arts and cultural sites related to that theme, then engage in self-reflection and self-evaluation of their learning.

Anticipated Instructor: Profs. Esther Boucher-Yip, Jennifer deWinter, Aarti Madan, Rebecca Moody and/or project center advisors.

Rationale:
WPI students have the option to complete the HUA Requirement at off-campus project center locations such as London, Rabat, Japan, and Buenos Aires. As part of their 1 unit of work at a project center, this 1/3 credit course will give students an opportunity to fully immerse themselves in culture of the project center where they will be working. This experiential learning component is the cultural immersion that engages students to the extent that they become active participants in their own development and learning. The goals of this course are to purposefully engage students in becoming an active, aware, and critical learner; develop their skills in critical thinking and reflective writing; and to provide students with opportunities to recognize and clarify connections between prior knowledge with the immersive experience. Throughout the experiential learning process, students will be actively engaged in posing questions, investigating, and constructing meaning. Faculty advisors support student learning by suggesting relevant resources, cultural activities and sites, and engage in discussions with students that will facilitate the learning process. Reflection on learning during and after students' experiences can be documented in reflective essays, blogs, and/or digital stories. This course will be offered "as needed" (Category III).

By the end of the course, students should be able to:
- Purposefully engage in becoming an active, aware, and critical learner.
- Develop skills in critical thinking and reflective writing.
- Recognize and clarify connections between prior knowledge (what you already know) with the immersive experience (what you are learning).

The proposed course number has not been used previously.

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2020-2021 academic year (C2021 and E2021).

Resource Needs: The course will be taught by faculty advisors assigned to the various project centers. No special software or additional library resources will be needed.

Impact on Distribution Requirements and Other Courses: The new course will have no impact on current distribution requirements. This course will be a permanent course offering in the HUA project center programs.

Date: March 19, 2020
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mathison, Chair)
Re: Motion to add GOV2318 approved by SSPS 11/6/2019

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends and I move, that GOV234X, *Comparative Healthcare: Policy, Politics, and Advocacy,* as described below, be added.

Course/Catalog Description:
GOV2318 - *Comparative Healthcare: Policy, Politics, and Advocacy,* Cat II
The topic of healthcare and health insurance is featured in the media daily and is on the policy table at the local, state, national, and global levels. Many students encounter healthcare issues in their course work or IQPs. In this course, students will gain an introduction to healthcare policy in the United States, which will be compared with health policies across the globe. Utilizing a healthcare disparities and social justice framework, the course explores mental and physical health care policy, history, the present and the future of U.S. health care policy, and how to advocate for policies that address healthcare disparities. The impact of health policy upon individuals, groups, families, and communities is addressed as well. The role of the various levels of government in the provision of healthcare services is covered, as is the role that technology can play in the advancement of healthcare. Students shall not receive credit for both GOV 234X and GOV 2318.

Recommended background: Basic background in public policy, such as GOV 1303

Anticipated Instructor: Emily Douglas

Rationale:

This course expands the offerings in the GOV sequence of courses. It responds to an increasing interest from students and administration in policy courses. It fits nicely with the minor in Global Public Health and potential graduate programs in policy and public health. If such graduate programs materialize, the GOV 2318 could be cross-listed with such a course.

Previously offering as an experimental course - summary

This course was offered as an experimental course in D19 and B19. Course evaluation information is offered below for D19 (B19 is obviously not available yet.)

Q1Avg	Q2Avg	Q7Avg	Q19Avg
4.52	4.67	4.24	2.52
4.40	4.70	3.90	2.40

Minor modifications were made to the course based on student feedback, including: (1) not using a textbook – but instead relying on peer-reviewed, government, and think tank publications, (2) changing the final assignment to a PowerPoint presentation instead of a poster presentation, and

(3) changing the grading distribution so that a larger proportion of the grade is attributed to discussion, since this is largely a discussion-based course.

Course enrollment:
D19, n=25
B19, n=14

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2021-2022 Academic year.

Resource Needs:
Please summarize basic resources needed to deliver this course, including the following:
- Information on the instructor (e.g., Does the department have an instructor available for this course?): The instructor has been teaching healthcare policy since 2011 and has done so approximately 10-12 times
- Classroom (e.g., room size and special requirements such as location or technology such as lecture-capture): No special classroom size is needed.
- Laboratory (computer or otherwise): None needed
- Library resources (including staff support as well as print and electronic resources): None needed
- Information Technology (special software or support from the Academic Technology center): None needed

Impact on Distribution Requirements and Other Courses: There will be no negative impact on the existing courses or curriculum. It will also serve as a springboard for a potential new grad program in global health and technology (part of the Global School).

Original experimental course proposal:

To: Chair, Committee on Academic Operations
From: Submitting Emily Douglas, DH, Social Science & Policy Studies
Re: Motion to add *GOV234X Comparative Healthcare: Policy, Politics, and Advocacy* approved by the SSPS department faculty on February 13, 2018.
Date: February 15, 2018

The Department of Social Science & Policy Studies requests the approval of the following experimental course, *GOV234X Comparative Healthcare: Policy, Politics, and Advocacy*

Contact: Prof. /Department Head Emily Douglas
Preferred term: D19
Expected enrollment: 30
Course type: Cat II
Intended audience: This course will be appropriate for majors in Society, Technology, & Policy program; minors in the Law & Technology program; minors in the Global Public Health program; and students who are fulfilling the required 2 social science courses.

Anticipated Instructor: Prof./Department Head Emily Douglas

Course/Catalog Description:
Course Number: GOV234X
Course Title: Comparative Healthcare: Policy, Politics, and Advocacy
Description: The topic of healthcare and health insurance is featured in the media daily and is on the policy table at the local, state, national, and global levels. Many students encounter healthcare issues in their course work or IQPs. In this course, students will gain an introduction to healthcare policy in the United States, which will be compared with health policies across the globe. Utilizing a healthcare disparities and social justice framework, the course explores mental and physical health care policy, history, the present and the future of U.S. health care policy, and how to advocate for policies that address healthcare disparities. The impact of health policy upon individuals, groups, families, and communities is addressed as well. The role of the various levels of government in the provision of healthcare services is covered, as is the role that technology can play in the advancement of healthcare.
Recommended background: Basic foundation in American government or public policy

Rationale: The learning objectives of this course are:
* To explore how health is conceptualized in the USA and across the globe.
* To understand policy formulation, agenda-setting, how topics make it to the policy-table, and how ideology informs policy-making within the context of healthcare.
* To learn about policy implementation of newly passed healthcare policies.
* To demonstrate accurate knowledge about standard mechanisms and structures of healthcare, including Medicare, Medicaid, Children's Health Insurance Program, and the different types of private health insurance.
* To identify new technologies that help to advance healthcare and delivery.
* To apply issues of social justice and accessibility to course assignments.
* To actively demonstrate knowledge of issues such as confidentiality, ethical considerations, and stigma.

Resource Needs:
Please summarize basic resources needed to deliver this course, including the following:
•   Information on the instructor: The instructor is the department head and has taught healthcare policy courses about 10 times
•   Classroom: A classroom of up to 30 students, with standard technology capability for having virtual guest speakers
•   Laboratory: No.
•   Library resources: No.
•   Information Technology: No special needs

Assessment: This course will be assessed using student feedback through course evaluations. Before becoming a permanent course, the instructor will offer feedback and reflection on whether the course met the learning objectives, student success and achievement in the classroom, and modifications that have been made in the course and assignments in order to fine tune the experimental course prior to it becoming a permanent offering.

Date: March 19, 2020
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mathison, Chair)
Re: Motion to add FP 4000 – Fire Laboratory approved by the Fire Protection Engineering Department on 1/6/2020.

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends and I move, that Fire Laboratory FP 4000 as described below, be added.

Course/Catalog Description: FP 4000 – Fire Laboratory, (Cat. I). This course will cover experimental methods used in fire research as well as other thermal-fluid topic areas. Students will learn fundamentals of metrology (calibration, sensor response constraints, uncertainty quantification), standard tests in fire research (i.e. cone calorimeter, fire propagation apparatus, etc.), as well as other measurement methods (thermocouples, heat flux gauges, velocimetry, thermometry, etc.). Students will also learn design of experiments and conduct a large-scale experiment in the UL performance lab.
Recommended background: MA 2051 Differential Equations and ES 3001 Thermodynamics.
Anticipated Instructor: Prof. James L Urban

Rationale:

Two goals of the FPE department are to develop an undergraduate minor and the further development of research activities in the department. Adding this course is a crucial step toward achieving both goals. The course provides an engaging opportunity for the undergraduate students by providing a course which they will take as part of the FPE minor. The class will provide the students with the proper foundation to conduct impressive MQP projects with laboratory fire testing or conduct fire research as an FPE graduate student. The direct and secondary experiences from this class will prepare the students well for fire research jobs in either industry, government, or academia. The course would also be suitable as an elective for students who want exposure to research in the broader thermal-fluids subject area which includes aspects of mechanical, aerospace, material science, and chemical engineering. The course will also be available as an optional class to first year FPE PhD students from other engineering disciplines to become more familiar with fire research on a case to case basis.

Currently, there is only one program in the United States which offers a bachelor's degree in FPE, the University of Maryland (UMD), while several other schools (including WPI) offer various graduate programs. The undergraduate enrollment in FPE at UMD is 140 while their graduate (M.S. or M. Eng) FPE enrollment is 47 - compared to 83, the average of the past 5 years at WPI). Considering that undergraduate students typically declare their major after completion of their first year, and graduate in four years, with completion of a master's degree typically taking at least one additional year. It seems that nationally, there is a similar interest between FPE undergraduate and graduate degrees. Thus, an enrollment projection of up to 83 students a year for this course seems reasonable. Additionally, many students enter WPI with the motivation of doing the 5-year BS/MS program with an MS in FPE. This laboratory experience would provide a course to help them develop and retain their interest during their undergraduate career.

A distinctive strength of the FPE department at WPI is the broad capacity for fire testing, specifically bench-scale experiments can be performed in the Fundamental's Laboratory and large-scale fire tests in the Performance Laboratory. The size of the performance lab is exclusive among

fire research labs at domestic universities. This in turn, has allowed for several unique research projects to be conducted including fire-whirls, oil burning on ice, drone operations in smoky environments, flame spread between trees, simulated dorm room fire, and a wildfire wind tunnel. In fact, some of these projects were collaborations with FPE departments from other institutions, which lacked the requisite laboratory facilities. The key advantage here that this lab provides the opportunity to give students a laboratory course where they can study large-scale fire behavior which is not possible at any other school in the US, setting WPI ahead.

The FPE department advisory board strongly supports the development of this course following the rationale described above. They have also expressed the feeling that this laboratory experience would make WPI graduates with an FPE minor more attractive job candidates to FPE firms or research organizations.

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2020-2021 Academic year.

Resource Needs:
Basic resources needed to deliver this course:
• Prof. James Urban is currently available to teach the course. Once developed, the majority of the faculty in the department could also teach the course and the new faculty hire will either be able to teach the course, or free another faculty member to teach the course.
• The course would require a classroom and use of the FPE's laboratories for the labs. (The FPE Classroom is adjacent to the Lab for scheduling.)
• Students would not need to access software beyond what is typically offered by WPI to all students or free. (MS office programs, MatLab/python).
• Laboratory staff are already in place and will help facilitate experiments and oversee use of capital equipment (i.e. cone calorimeter, fire propagation apparatus, and FTIR gas analyzer)
• The department will provide standard materials such as samples, thermocouples, and data acquisition.

Impact on Distribution Requirements and Other Courses:
This course does not replace any existing courses and will have minimal impact on existing programs. If an undergraduate student takes the course and joins the 5ˉyear master's program, it could be counted as a graduate course with the approval of the FPE department head. This will be a unique course that will differentiate our FPE education from the competition because we will leverage the distinctive capabilities of our laboratories.

Date: March 19, 2020
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mathison, Chair)
Re: Motion to add a Minor in Financial Technology (FinTech), approved by FBS on February 12, 2020.

Motion: On behalf of the Foisie Business School (FBS), the Committee on Academic Operations recommends and I move, that the minor in Financial Technology (FinTech) as described below, be added.

Catalog Description: Minor in Financial Technology (FinTech)
The Financial Technology (FinTech) minor is designed for students interested in doing an MQP with the Wall St. project center and/or pursuing a career in the financial technology industry, but are not seeking a B.S. in Business with a concentration in FinTech. The financial technology industry and the Wall St. project center are seeking students with technical degrees, e.g., in CS, ECE, IE, MA, but those students also should have some financial and business background. This minor provides that background. It is open to all students, except those seeking a B.S. in Business with a concentration in FinTech.

Recommended background: Ideally, students enrolling in this minor have some knowledge of programming (equivalent to 2/3 units from CS 1004, CS 1101/1102, CS 2102/2103, CS 2119), statistics and/or probability (equivalent to 2/3 units from MA 2611, MA 2612, MA 2621), and differential and integral calculus (equivalent to 2/3 units from MA 1020/1021, MA 1022). Most WPI students will have such background as part of their distribution requirements in technical majors.
Successful candidates for the FinTech Minor must meet the following requirements:

1. Three courses (3/3 units) in accounting and finance as follows (or equivalent courses approved by the FBS undergraduate committee):
   - BUS 2060 Financial Statements for Decision Making
   - BUS 2070 Risk Analysis for Decision Making
   - FIN 3300 Finance, Risk Analysis, and Technology
2. One course (1/3 unit) in database technology, selected from:
   - CS 3431 Database Systems I
   - MIS 3270 Business Data Management
3. One FinTech related elective (1/3 unit), selected from:
   - Business courses: BUS 1010, BUS 2080, OIE 2081, OIE 4420, MIS 3787, MIS 4084, MIS 4741
   - Advanced Computer Science courses, 2000-level or above (excluding CS 3043)
   - Data Science courses: any course with the DS prefix
   - Economics courses: ECON 1110, ECON 2110, ECON 2130
   - Advanced mathematics courses: 2000-level or above; Actuarial Mathematics courses (MA 2211, MA 2212, MA 3212, MA 3213) and MA 3231, MA 4235 and MA 4237 are especially relevant. The following courses are excluded (MA 2251, MA 2610, MA 3823, MA 3825, MA 3831, MA 3832, MA 4291, MA 4603, MA 4891).

4. One integrating capstone course (1/3 unit) selected from:
   - CS 3733 Software Engineering
   - MIS 4720 Systems Analysis and Design

Contact Instructors:
Diane Strong, FBS, Department Head (primary contact for this proposal)
Robert Sarnie, FBS, Wall St. Project Center Director
Marcel Blais, MA, Wall St. Project Center, MA advisor
Wilson Wong, CS, Wall St. Project Center, CS advisor

Rationale: See catalog description. The proposed FinTech minor provides students with the background for doing well in an MQP associated with the Wall St. project center and for obtaining jobs in the financial technology industry. It also enables students to indicate that interest on their transcript.

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2020-2021 Academic year.

Resource Needs: No new resources are needed since this minor is comprised of existing courses.

Impact on Distribution Requirements and Other Courses: None. This proposal has been reviewed by the following departments/programs: Computer Science, Data Science, Economics, and Mathematical Sciences

Robert A. Foisie School of Business
Financial Technology (FinTech) Minor
Program Planning and Completion Form
The FinTech Minor is available to students in any major at WPI except for those majoring in BU, FinTech concentration.

Student Name: _____ Student ID #: _____ Major: _____

Email Address: _____ Academic Advisor: _____ Class Year: _____

The Financial Technology (FinTech) minor is designed for students interested in doing an MQP with the Wall St. project center and/or pursuing a career in the financial technology.

Program Requirements	**Course**	**Term**	**Grade**
1. Select three (3) courses in accounting & finance: • **BUS 2060** Financial Statements for Decision Making • **BUS 2070** Risk Analysis for Decision Making • **FIN 3300** Finance, Risk Analysis, and Technology	**1.** _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____		
2. Select one (1) in database technology: • **CS 3431** Database Systems I • **MIS 3270** Business Data Management	**2.** _____ _____ _____		
3. Select one (1) FinTech related elective: • **Business courses:** BUS 1010, BUS 2080, OIE 2081, OIE 4420, MIS 3787, MIS 4084, MIS 4741 • **Advanced Computer Science courses,** 2000-level or above (excluding CS 3043) • **Data Science courses:** any course with the DS prefix • **Economics courses:** ECON 1110, ECON 2110, ECON 2130 • **Advanced mathematics courses:** 2000-level or above; Actuarial Mathematics courses (MA 2211, MA 2212, MA 3212, MA 3213) and MA 3231, MA 4235 and MA 4237 are especially relevant. The following courses are excluded (MA 2251, MA 2610, MA 3823, MA 3825, MA 3831, MA 3832, MA 4291, MA 4603, MA 4891).	**3.** _____ _____ _____		
4. Select one (1) integrating capstone course: • **CS 3733** Software Engineering • **MIS 4720** Systems Analysis and Design	**4.** _____ _____ _____		

Certification of Completion of Minor Requirements. Upon completion of the minor program, <mark>*submit this form along with a copy of your unofficial transcript*</mark> to the Robert A. Foisie School of Business.

_____26_____ _____
Chair, Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee   **Date**
Robert A. Foisie School of Business   Revised 03/02/2020

Date: March 19, 2020
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Graduate Studies and Research (Prof. Fischer, Chair)
Re: Motion to change course Title and Description for the existing RBE/ME 521 course, which was previously approved by the Mechanical Engineering Department and Robotics Engineering program in Fall 2018.

Motion: The Committee on Graduate Studies and Research recommends and I move that the following catalog changes for the course title and description of ME/RBE 521 be approved.

Current title and description
RBE/ME 521. Advanced Robotics - Parallel and Walking Mechanisms
Foundations and principles of parallel and walking mechanisms. Topics include advanced spatial/3D kinematics and dynamics of parallel manipulators and legged/walking mechanisms including workspace analysis, inverse and forward kinematics and dynamics, gait analysis of walking mechanisms, motion analysis of parallel mechanisms as well as legged and walking mechanisms, stability/balance analysis of walking mechanisms, and control of parallel manipulators and walking mechanisms. The course will be useful for solving problems dealing with parallel manipulators as well as multi-legged walking mechanisms including humanoid robots, quadruped robots, hexapod robots and all other types of legged walking mechanisms. A final term project would allow students to apply all this information to design, analyze, and simulate parallel and walking mechanisms. Students taking this course are expected to have a background in kinematics and dynamics.

Revised title and description
RBE/ME 521. Legged Robotics
Foundations and principles of parallel manipulators and legged robots. Topics include advanced spatial/3D kinematics and dynamics of parallel manipulators and legged robots including workspace analysis, inverse and forward kinematics and dynamics, motion analysis and control, and gait and stability/balance analysis of legged robots. The course will be useful for solving problems dealing with parallel manipulators as well as multi-legged robots including, but not limited to, quadruped robots, hexapod robots and any other types of multi-legged robots. A final term project allows students to show mastery of the subject by designing, analyzing, and simulating parallel and/or legged robots of their choice.
Recommended Background: RBE 500, RBE 501

Rationale: The above change in the course title is to make it concise and understandable by students. It is also more general compared to the current course title. For example, the revised title encompasses running robots as well while the current title does not. This is good if the instructor chooses to include running robots in the course materials as well. The revised title also fixes the issue of using abbreviations in the course title when listed under bannerweb, which by itself has been a source of confusion for students in the past. The change in the course description is minor. In general, the revised title and description serve to communicate better to students about the content of the course.

Impact on Degree Requirements: None.

Resources and Anticipated Instructors: No additional resources are required.

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2020-2021 academic year.

Committee Business

Date: March 19, 2020
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Governance (Prof. Gaudette, Chair)
Re: Motion to allow remote voting in emergency settings only

Motion #1: The Committee on Governance (COG) recommends and I move that synchronous remote voting be allowed at Faculty Meetings until the start of AY2021.

Rationale: Given the current situation around COVID 19, it is important to eliminate or minimize faculty presence on campus. However, today's technology allows for "remote" meetings. This technology can be used to conduct Faculty meetings, including Faculty votes. This motion will allow for Faculty meeting operations to continue during this emergency situation. Synchronous remote voting will expire at the start of next academic year, although Faculty can consider a separate motion to extend at a later time.

Motion #2: The Committee on Governance (COG) recommends and I move that if a Faculty meeting cannot be convened in a timely manner for any reason, Faculty Governance chairs, the Secretary of the Faculty and the Committee on Governance will have the power to vote on critical issues until the start of AY2021.

Rationale: In the current crisis, emergency situations may arise where Faculty approval is urgently needed. In emergency cases where waiting for the next scheduled Faculty meeting is not soon enough for a decision, a vote by a majority of the Faculty Governance chairs, the Secretary of the Faculty and the Committee on Governance can serve as an interim decision of the Faculty. This group is large enough to represent the campus while also being small enough to quickly convene.

Date: March 19, 2020
To: The WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Governance (Prof. Gaudette, Chair)
Re: Motion to elevate the Aerospace Engineering Program to an independent Aerospace Engineering Department

<u>Motion:</u> The Committee on Governance recommends, and I move that the WPI faculty endorse the Administration's proposal to elevate the Aerospace Engineering Program to the status of an independent Aerospace Engineering Department at WPI.

Rationale
At the COG meeting of January 27, 2020, Provost Soboyejo provided a detailed proposal and the rationale for elevating the Aerospace Engineering Program (AEP) to a new independent Aerospace Engineering Department. The proposal was presented by the Provost on behalf of the WPI Administration. The proposal has been endorsed by all nine (9) faculty members who would become members of the Aerospace Engineering Department (AED), ME faculty, and the Head of the Mechanical Engineering Department. COG discussed the proposal on February 3, 2020 and endorsed the proposal unanimously.

The full detailed AED proposal is attached as an appendix to this motion. It describes the status of current Aerospace Program at WPI, the distinguishing features of the proposed Aerospace Engineering Department, the ways in which the proposed department will continue to align with WPI's mission, the administrative structure and external outreach of the proposed AED, resources required, and the positive impact that an independent Aerospace Engineering Department will have on the Mechanical Engineering Department at WPI.

<u>Background</u>
The Aerospace Engineering Program (AEP) at WPI awarded its first B.S. degree in 2005, was accredited by ABET in 2009, and awarded its first M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in 2014. The AEP currently enrolls over 260 undergraduate students and nearly 40 graduate students. There are now nine (9) core-faculty associated with the AEP with one ongoing search, all with current full-time appointments in the Mechanical Engineering Department (MED). It is the 7th largest field of study at WPI (based on the students in its BS, MS and PhD degrees). The program has become nationally recognized and is currently ranked 7th out of 52 in the 2019 College Factual Best Aerospace & Aeronautical Engineering Colleges in the U.S. Within only four years of its introduction, the AE graduate program was ranked 39th in the 2019 US News and World Report Rankings, tied with schools such as George Washington University, Washington University St. Louis, and Syracuse University.

The AEP has established a diverse funding portfolio in aeronautics and astronautics, and an infrastructure that includes close to 6,000 sqf of specialized facilities. While organizationally the AEP is part of the MED, it has a Program Director, dedicated staff, a cost center, TA allocation, and an overall independent administrative and faculty-governance functionality comparable to other engineering departments at WPI.

Discussions between the AEP faculty, the MED Head and the administration about the

establishment of an independent AED began in 2012. In a series of procedural steps, the proposal was also approved unanimously by the ME Department (11/17/2015) and the ME External Advising Board (5/2016) as a motion to *"Elevate the Aerospace Engineering program to the status of an academic department (AE)."* During the Fall of 2019 the Provost and Dean of Engineering conducted a series of meetings with the leadership of the AEP and MED, and led the development of the final proposal. This process culminated by the administration's decision to establish the AED. The current proposal has been endorsed by all current faculty (8 TTT and 1 NTT) members of the AEP and the MED Head.

Benefits of Establishing an Aerospace Department
An independent Aerospace Engineering Department (AED) would immediately establish WPI as one of only five universities (along with MIT, Penn State, U. Maryland, and the US Naval Academy) with stand-alone AE departments in the Northeast, and would be prominently placed in a select group of about 80 (single- and double-named) aerospace engineering departments in the U.S. As such, it will position WPI as a leader in aerospace engineering education and research.

In this dedicated academic configuration, the AED will attract a larger and stronger pool of applicants to WPI than is possible today, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The AED has significant opportunities for growth due to:
- the strong demand for AE graduates at all levels, from B.S. to Ph.D.;
- a strong outlook in AE research for emerging civilian and defense applications; and
- a robust aerospace industry with more than 200 establishments in the Northeast alone.

The AED will offer a modern aerospace curriculum of 36 AE undergraduate and graduate courses that incorporate the research expertise of the AE faculty. As a brand new initiative, the AED will develop the first all-online, M.S. degree in aerospace engineering. Along with the ongoing expansion of its BS/MS program, this will lead to new opportunities for tuition revenue from local students, from those across the country and beyond, as well as from close to 200 major aerospace employers in our region.

The AED will further establish WPI's identity as a research university and will enhance the stature of WPI's School of Engineering. An independent AED represented at national meetings by its Head, will lead to greater recognition from peer institutions, college ranking services, and sponsors.

The new AED will provide its students and faculty a distinct community at WPI, with the tools, resources, and visibility available only to academic departments. The AED will allow the AE faculty to realize their full professional potential, will make it easier to recruit new faculty members, and will implement WPI's established departmental processes for evaluation, tenure and promotion within a cohesive community. At the same time, because of the organizational progress made to date, AED will require very modest additional institutional investment.

The AED will become the visible focal point for aerospace education and research at WPI. It will support and grow research in rapidly emerging areas through strategic planning, strategic faculty hiring and careful coordination of faculty efforts. Aeronautics research will involve emerging technologies in advanced jet propulsion concepts, flow control, autonomy, unmanned aerial

vehicle (UAV) applications, and structural materials. In addition, the AED will seek new opportunities to promote research in advanced renewable energy concepts and green aviation. Astronautics research will involve emerging spacecraft technologies supporting microspacecraft design, electric micropropulsion, controls, spacecraft/environment interactions, and mission analysis. The AED will aggressively pursue participation as partners in national and international space programs and missions, a task that will be facilitated significantly by recognition as an established department. We anticipate an immediate positive impact through research collaboration with other engineering and science departments.

The establishment of an AED will also have a positive impact on the Mechanical Engineering Department (MED). Reduced to a more manageable size, the more focused ME department will still constitute the largest engineering department at WPI, housing three distinct academic programs, one undergraduate degree program and seven graduate degree programs.

Five-year Projections:
By AY 2023-24, the Aerospace Engineering Department is expected to award approximately 70 B.S., 45 M.S. and 3 to 4 Ph.D. degrees annually. In the same time period, research expenditures are also projected to increase by roughly 100 percent from the FY 2019 level. In order to accommodate and accomplish this growth, the number of faculty members in the AED is projected to grow from 9 FTEs (8 TTTs and 1 NTT) currently to 11 FTEs (10 TTTs and 1 NTT) in AY 2021-22. The size of such a student body and faculty is consistent with that of other departments at WPI.

Resources Committed to Establish the AE Department
Faculty
- 1 TTT to join in 2020-21 (search in progress) in areas of aerospace structures;
- 1 TTT to join in 2021-22 (search in 2020-21) in areas of aeronautics / space science;

Beyond 2021-22, faculty hiring will be determined with Aerospace Engineering participating with regular departmental status in the annual planning and budget process.
Office Space
- Two faculty offices (TBD location in HL);
- AED office for dept. head and administrative assistant (TBD repurposed space in HL).

Implementation and Evaluation
The Aerospace Engineering Department at WPI will be formally established on July 1, 2020. An internal search for the AED Head position will begin immediately and conclude well before July 1, 2020. The department will continue to offer B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees in aerospace engineering.

No immediate (AY 2020-21) changes are recommended to staffing or for internal funding levels. Future infrastructure investments, faculty hires, and other additional resource needs will be discussed as they arise as part of the annual budget process where an independent AED will have its formal inputs.

All current faculty members (8 TTT and 1 NTT) of the AEP will join the AED. The TTT faculty member to be selected from the ongoing faculty search in Aerospace Structures will also be a full member of the new AED, which will bring the total number of full-time AED faculty members to

ten by July 1, 2020.

As part of the 2- and 4-year reviews of the Department Head, the Dean will evaluate performance of the AED relative to the projections to confirm the continuing health and progress as an independent department.

Date: March 19, 2020
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations and Committee on Academic Policy
Re: Motion to modify policy allowing Commencement participation for undergraduate students who have not yet completed their requirements.

Motion: The Committee on Academic Policy and the Committee on Academic Operations recommend, and I move that the Undergraduate catalog section on Commencement Policy be modified as described below.

Current language: (pg. 200, 2019-2020 catalog)
The policy for allowing certain undergraduate students who have not completed all degree requirements to participate in Commencement exercises is:
  1. Undergraduate students who have not met all degree requirements will be eligible to participate in Commencement exercises only if all of the following are true:
  a. At the end of D term, the student is within 1/3 unit of one activity in all requirements for graduation.
  b. The student has completed at least 2 of the 3 WPI Project Requirements (Humanities and Arts Requirement, IQP, and MQP).
  2. Undergraduate students who meet these conditions will be permitted to participate in Commencement exercises but will not receive their diploma. The names of such students will not be included in the Commencement program. The actual degree will be conferred only after all degree requirements have been completed.
  3. All WPI undergraduate students will be notified of these policies and procedures each B term.
  4. Undergraduate students seeking an exception to this policy have the right to petition the Committee on Academic Operations for a waiver due to extenuating circumstances. Petitions must be received no later than noon (12 p.m.) the Wednesday before Commencement Day

Proposed revisions (additions *underlined* and deletions ~~struck through~~):
The policy for allowing certain undergraduate students who have not completed all degree requirements to participate in Commencement exercises is:
  1. Undergraduate students who have not met all degree requirements will be eligible to participate in Commencement exercises only if all of the following are true:
  a. At the end of D term, the student is within ~~1/3~~ *1* unit of *completing* ~~one activity in~~ all requirements for graduation.
  b. The student has completed at least 2 of the 3 WPI Project Requirements (Humanities and Arts Requirement, IQP, and MQP).
  2. Undergraduate students who meet these conditions will be permitted to participate in Commencement exercises but will not receive their diploma. The names of such students will not be included in the Commencement program. The actual degree will be conferred only after all degree requirements have been completed. *The student will not be eligible to participate in any future commencement ceremonies for this degree.*
  ~~3. All WPI undergraduate students will be notified of these policies and procedures each B term.~~

3. ~~4.~~ ~~Undergraduate students seeking an exception to this policy have the right to petition the Committee on Academic Operations for a waiver due to extenuating circumstances. Petitions must be received no later than noon (12 p.m.) the Wednesday before Commencement Day~~ *There are no exceptions to this policy.*

Note on change to item 2: This has always been the practice but this language should be written into the catalog for clarity.

Rationale: The Committee on Academic Operations is responsible for reviewing and making decisions on petitions for students who do not meet the minimum requirement for participation. CAO determined that a review was in order; when the policy was originally written, WPI held two ceremonies each year but have since moved to one, and this has had an impact on the petition process. The policy was discussed in A-term 2018 and again A-term 2019. Benchmarking and a review of walkers (those who had to petition and those who did not) and ultimate graduation status were submitted by the Registrar.
Benchmark institutions handle this in a variety of ways – there is no clear best practice. Some do not offer any option for participation without completion of requirements; some allow anyone slated to finish in the subsequent summer; others are similar to our current policy, but with no exceptions.

CAO reviewed students who had participated in commencements for 2017, 2018, and 2019. Students who did not have to petition to participate because they were only 1/3 out were highly likely to complete in the subsequent summer or fall. Results for petitioners were mixed, but a majority had graduated within one year of the commencement they participated in. There were cases in both groups that had yet to earn a degree. In general, petitions that were granted were in cases where students were 2 – 3/3 away from graduating. Students further away were generally denied.

The committee observed that the petition process causes anxiety for students, and the very short turn-around time for the committee heightens the anxiety for all involved. While we do see some petitions early in the semester (typically from students who know they will not meet the conditions already), most stem from NR's received in D-term, so conditions are emotionally fraught. Registrar's Office staff state that when there was no participation policy and only students who had completed were eligible, students and their parents, although understandably upset, understood the rule. Petitions are always difficult to decide – each reviewer has their own definition of extenuating circumstances, and there is further room for inconsistency as committee membership changes. Removing the exception clause allows for a clear line that can be understood by students and parents, and the rule becomes easier to communicate and consistently enforce by the Registrar staff.

While we could achieve this clarity and consistency by simply removing the participation rule all together, CAO recognizes that the current policy has allowed many students and their parents to have a memorable commencement experience, and most of the students have subsequently earned their degrees. In reviewing previous approvals, the most common allowance is for 2/3 or 3/3 remaining. Sometimes this is for NRs earned, but also comes into play for students participating in co-ops. We feel that allowing one unit, the typical load of one term, to be

remaining is generous enough to fit most of the exceptions we are currently making and, in hand with allowing no exceptions, can be reasonably explained and enforced.

We chose to remove item 3 regarding the notification of these policies and procedures because it should not be required to remind students about the existing policies that are clearly outlined in the catalog.

Date: March 19, 2020
To: WPI Faculty
From: COG (Prof Gaudette, Chair) and COAP (Prof. Weathers)
Re: Changes in Faculty Handbook regarding Faculty Sabbatical Leaves and other Leaves of Absence

COAP submits three motions to COG for its consideration and transmittal to the WPI Faculty regarding faculty sabbatical leaves and other leaves of absence. If approved, the motions would amend the Faculty Handbook as described in each respective motion.

Motion 1: That review of sabbatical leave applications no longer be handled by COAP, but instead be reviewed by department heads (as is currently done) and the appropriate Dean prior to the request being sent to the Provost.

Motion 2: Clarify the wording in the Faculty Handbook related to years required for eligibility to take a sabbatical leave. Remove mention of one-term sabbatical leaves of absence, which are no longer available as of 2006.

Motion 3: Change the review process for requests for unpaid leaves of absence to parallel the process for requests for sabbatical leaves of absence.

Date: March 19, 2020
To: The WPI Faculty
From: COG (Prof Gaudette, Chair) and COAP (Prof. Weathers)
Re: Update to Sabbatical Leave Process

Motion 1: The COG and COAP recommend, and we move that review of sabbatical leave applications no longer be handled by COAP, but instead be reviewed by department heads (as is currently done) and the appropriate Dean prior to the request being sent to the Provost by amending the Faculty Handbook as follows:

Rationale: COAP currently reviews all sabbatical leave application requests by tenure track faculty. The process is described in the Faculty Handbook:
1. Faculty member requests their Department Head review their plans for sabbatical leave.
2. Department Head verifies with the Provost that "all administrative requirements have been cleared".
3. Department Head writes Letter of Support.
4. Faculty member submits application for sabbatical leave, including Department Head Letter of Support, to COAP.
5. COAP reviews application and make recommendation to the Provost.
6. Provost makes the final determination to approve or decline the sabbatical leave.

This process was instituted long before WPI had Deans, and has not been updated to reflect the Deans' roles. Furthermore, COAP's role is perfunctory in that the committee reviews the application package for completeness before sending it to the Provost, after the Department Head and Provost have already reviewed the application. It is COAP's determination that its role is superfluous. COAP recommends that the sabbatical approval process follow the organizational structure from Department Head to Dean to Provost.

Updates to Faculty Handbook:
Pg. 1-12:
Current wording:
COAP makes recommendations to the Provost regarding recipients of sabbatical leaves, and represents
the Faculty to the President and Provost on appointment, reappointment, and performance evaluation of academic Department Heads.

Change to read:
COAP ~~*makes recommendations to the Provost regarding recipients of sabbatical leaves, and*~~ *represents the Faculty to the President and Provost on appointment, reappointment, and performance evaluation of academic Department Heads.*

Pg. 2-41:
Current wording:
a. Faculty members should submit requests for sabbatical leaves to the Committee on Appointments and Promotions on or before the following dates:

Change to read:

a. Faculty members should submit requests for sabbatical leaves to ~~the Committee on Appointments and Promotions~~ *their Dean on or before the following dates:*

Pg. 2-42:

Current wording:

b. The application should be accompanied by supporting documentation from the faculty member's department head. This documentation should include a review of the faculty member's proposed sabbatical program with regard to its appropriateness; the impact of the sabbatical on department operations; a statement that all administrative requirements have been cleared with the Provost; and the department recommendation on the proposed sabbatical. In the case of an application for a sabbatical leave by a department head, this additional documentation will be supplied by the Provost.

c. The Committee on Appointments and Promotions reviews all application materials and supporting documentation, and forwards its recommendation to the Provost.

d. The Provost reviews all leave applications, together with recommendations from the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, and makes the final determination of the request.

Change to read:

b. The application should be accompanied by supporting documentation from the faculty member's department head. This documentation should include a review of the faculty member's proposed sabbatical program with regard to its appropriateness; the impact of the sabbatical on department operations; ~~a statement that all administrative requirements have been cleared with the Provost;~~ *and the department recommendation on the proposed sabbatical. In the case of an application for a sabbatical leave by a department head, this additional documentation will be supplied by the* ~~Provost~~ *appropriate Dean.*

c. The ~~Committee on Appointments and Promotions~~ *appropriate Dean reviews all application materials and supporting documentation, and forwards* ~~its~~ *their recommendation to the Provost with copies of the sabbatical checklist and the recommendation to the Committee on Appointments and Promotions.*

d. The Provost reviews all leave applications, together with recommendations from the ~~Committee on Appointments and Promotions~~ *Deans, makes the final determination of the requests, and sends copies of the decision letters to the Committee on Appointments and Promotions.*

Date: March 19, 2020
To: The WPI Faculty
From: COG (Prof Gaudette, Chair) and COAP (Prof. Weathers)
Re: Update to Faculty Handbook regarding eligibility to take sabbatical leave and
               removal of one-term sabbatical leaves

Motion 2: The COG and COAP recommend, and we move to clarify the wording in the Faculty
Handbook related to years required for eligibility to take a sabbatical leave and remove mention
of one-term sabbatical leaves of absence, which are no longer available as of 2006, by amending
the Faculty Handbook as documented below.

Rationale: Current wording allows faculty who have departed WPI, given up their tenured or
tenure-track position, taken jobs elsewhere, and then returned to WPI to abuse the sabbatical
leave privilege by counting time at WPI and elsewhere toward sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leaves
are an earned privilege, representing an investment by the university in faculty professional
development and renewal following full-time activity. COAP contends that faculty should count
their 6 or 3 years of full-time activity since their most recent hiring at WPI in order to be eligible
for sabbatical leave. Also, single-term sabbaticals have not been allowed since January 2006.
The current motion updates the Faculty Handbook to reflect this practice.

Updates to Faculty Handbook:
Current language in the Faculty Handbook (~~deleted~~, proposed)
Pg. 2-41; C. Policy on Sabbatical Leaves; 1. Basic Objectives; paragraph 3:
Current wording:
*Sabbatical leaves may be taken for a full academic year, a half-year, or one term. All full-time
tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to apply for a full-year or half-year sabbatical leave
after 6 years of full-time service since their initial hiring at WPI or since their previous
sabbatical, or for a one-term sabbatical leave after 3 years of full-time service since their initial
hiring at WPI or since their previous sabbatical.*

Change to read:
*Sabbatical leaves may be taken for a full academic year or a half academic year~~, a half-year, or
one term~~. All full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to apply for a full-year or
half-year sabbatical leave after 6 years of full-time service since their ~~initial~~ most recent hiring
at WPI or since their previous sabbatical~~, or for a one-term sabbatical leave after 3 years of full-
time service since their initial hiring at WPI or since their previous sabbatical~~. Time spent on
unpaid leave or less than half-time activity, although considered continuous service, do not
count as full-time service toward sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leaves can only be taken by
tenured faculty.*

Pg. 2-41; C. Policy on Sabbatical Leaves; 2. Financial Arrangements:
Current wording:
2. Financial Arrangements
        *a. A full year sabbatical leave is taken at one-half of the faculty member's academic year
        salary. Half-year and one-term leaves are taken at full salary. If the faculty member
        obtains salary support from outside sources, WPI's contribution will not exceed that*

required to maintain the faculty member's normal salary. Exceptions to this policy must be negotiated before the leave starts.

Change to read:

2. Financial Arrangements

a. A full year sabbatical leave is taken at one-half of the faculty member's academic year salary. Half-year ~~and one-term~~ leaves are taken at full salary. If the faculty member obtains salary support from outside sources, WPI's contribution will not exceed that required to maintain the faculty member's normal salary. Exceptions to this policy must be negotiated before the leave starts.

Pg. 2-41; C. Policy on Sabbatical Leaves; 3. Procedures for Review and Award:

Current wording:

a. Faculty members should submit requests for sabbatical leaves to the Committee on Appointments and Promotions on or before the following dates:

 Full year and half-year sabbaticals:
 December 15 for proposed leaves in the following academic year.
 One-term sabbaticals:
 October 1 for proposed leaves in following C term or later
 November 15 for proposed leaves in following D term or later
 February 1 for proposed leaves in following A term or later
 April 1 for proposed leaves in following B term or later

. . .

e. For full-year and half-year sabbatical leaves, notification of the award will be made no later than the time of issuance of appointment letters. For one-term sabbatical leaves, notification of the award will be made no later than the end of the term in which the application is submitted.

Change to read:

a. Faculty members should submit requests for sabbatical leaves to the Committee on Appointments and Promotions on or before December 15 for proposed leaves in the following academic year ~~the following dates:~~

 ~~*Full year and half-year sabbaticals:*~~
 ~~*December 15 for proposed leaves in the following academic year.*~~
 ~~*One-term sabbaticals:*~~
 ~~*October 1 for proposed leaves in following C term or later*~~
 ~~*November 15 for proposed leaves in following D term or later*~~
 ~~*February 1 for proposed leaves in following A term or later*~~
 ~~*April 1 for proposed leaves in following B term or later*~~

. . .

e. ~~For full-year and half-year sabbatical leaves, n~~Notification of the award will be made no later than the time of issuance of appointment letters. ~~For one-term sabbatical leaves, notification of the award will be made no later than the end of the term in which the application is submitted.~~

Date: March 19, 2020
To: The WPI Faculty
From: COG (Prof Gaudette, Chair) and COAP (Prof. Weathers)
Re: Update Unpaid Leaves of Absence process to parallel Sabbatical Leave Process

Motion 3: The Committee on Governance recommends, and I move to change the review process for requests for unpaid leaves of absence to parallel the process for requests for sabbatical leaves of absence by amending the Faculty Handbook as described below.

Rationale: The process for approving requests for unpaid leaves of absence should parallel the process for sabbatical leaves, following the organizational structure from Department Head to Dean to Provost.

Pg. 2-43:
Current wording:
On occasion, faculty members may wish to pursue a professional opportunity off-campus and request a leave of absence without salary and fringe benefits. WPI expects the host institution to assume the institutional costs of benefits. These leaves can be for periods of time that fit in with the academic program, up to a maximum of 2 years, and should involve experience in government, industry, or academia that contributes to the professional development of the faculty member. This type of leave requires the approval of the appropriate department head and the Provost.

Change to read:
On occasion, faculty members may wish to pursue a professional opportunity off-campus and request a leave of absence without salary and fringe benefits. WPI expects the host institution to assume the institutional costs of benefits. These leaves can be for periods of time that fit in with the academic program, up to a maximum of 2 years, and should involve experience in government, industry, or academia that contributes to the professional development of the faculty member. This type of leave requires the approval of the appropriate department head, Dean, and the Provost.

Pg. 2-44:
Current wording:
Although unpaid leave requests are not reviewed by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions it is desirable that such requests take the form of sabbatical leave requests and are accompanied by documentation from the department head.

Change to read:
~~Although unpaid leave requests are not reviewed by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions it is desirable that such requests~~ Unpaid leave requests should take the form of sabbatical leave requests, which ~~and~~ are accompanied by documentation from the department head.

Date: March 19, 2020
To: The WPI Faculty
From: COG (Prof Gaudette, Chair) and COAP (Prof. Weathers)
Re: Motion to modify the procedure for providing feedback to faculty candidates who are denied promotion

Motion: COG and COAP recommend and we move that the procedures (described in the Faculty Handbook, Part Two, Section 1.D.2.5) for providing written feedback to faculty candidates who have been denied promotion be modified so that the letter comes only from the Dean and the Provost as described below.

Background: On May 8, 2018, COAP brought to the Faculty a motion to revise the feedback procedure in the case of a negative promotion decision. Following discussion by the Faculty, the motion was returned to COAP for reconsideration. This is COAP's revised motion, which addresses the three goals set forth in Rationale 1, below.

Rationale:
1. The proposed policy has three goals: 1) To enhance the clarity of the promotion process, 2) To maintain the confidentiality of candidates who have been denied promotion, and 3) To ensure a complete feedback in the case of a negative promotion decision so that the candidate may appropriately address any shortcomings for future promotion evaluations.
2. The same procedure for providing feedback from a negative or a positive decision must be used regardless of whether COAP and the Provost agree or disagree.
3. In case of a disagreement between COAP and the Provost on a given case, the Provost's decision is the final one, and it is then difficult to write a joint letter from COAP and the Provost. Furthermore, it would be inappropriate for COAP members to sign a letter that runs counter to its unitary recommendation.
4. The Joint Promotion Committee's recommendation letter may contain confidential information, such as names of references, or may allow the inference of confidential information. Thus, it is imperative that the candidate not see this letter.

Although it is not stated in the motion, it is understood from the context of the Faculty Handbook that this policy only applies to academic promotions from Assistant to Associate Professor that occur prior to the scheduled tenure review year and academic promotions from Associate Professor to Professor.

There are no corresponding procedures for Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty promotions in the Faculty Handbook. Nonetheless, it is recommended that the same procedure be followed to provide feedback in the event of a negative decision.

Description of the proposed modifications: (with deleted text ~~struck through~~ and added text in red):

1. POLICIES REGARDING THE STATUS OF FACULTY
D. Promotion*
D.2. Procedures for Promotion Nomination and Review
D.2.5. Review by the Joint Promotion Committee, Dean, and Provost
The Joint Promotion Committee reviews a nomination for promotion in order to make a recommendation to the appropriate Dean and the Provost.

In Term A and Term B of the academic year of the promotion review, the Joint Promotion Committee meets to consider the merits of the nomination for promotion. The Joint Committee reviews the complete promotion dossier (described in section D.1.3) including the letters of appraisal from Professional Associates and External Reviewers. The welfare of the candidate must be protected by all members of the Joint Committee by observing strict rules of confidentiality during all phases of the promotion review. When all the members of the Joint Promotion Committee agree that there has been sufficient discussion, a vote is taken by the six voting members of the Joint Committee for or against promotion (no abstentions) by means of a secret ballot, with the majority ruling. By the end of Term B, the Joint Committee forwards to the Dean and the Provost a letter conveying the result of its vote as a unitary recommendation for or against promotion and summarizing the salient reasons for its recommendation.

The Provost reviews each case and consults with the Dean and the President. Subsequently, the Provost may ask to meet with the Joint Committee to discuss any of its recommendations and must meet with the Joint Committee in the case of potential disagreement. Lastly, the Provost sends to the Board of Trustees the names of candidates for whom promotion is recommended. ***At no time shall the identity of any faculty member who was not recommended for promotion be disclosed to the members of the Board of trustees.*** The Provost will inform the candidate of the Board's decision.

In the event of a negative decision on promotion, a ~~joint~~ letter to the candidate discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the case for promotion will be written by ~~the Joint Promotion Committee,~~ the Dean, and the Provost*. The purpose of this letter is to provide constructive advice to the candidate so that they may address any deficiencies and resubmit the case for promotion consideration in the future. The candidate may meet with the Provost, Dean, or the Nominator to discuss ~~this letter~~ reasons for the promotion decision.

If a candidate for promotion wishes to appeal a negative decision, faculty grievance procedures are available to the extent provided by a Faculty Review Committee (Bylaw One, IX).