

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

January 20, 2022

To: The WPI Faculty
From: Mark Richman
Secretary of the Faculty

The fifth Faculty meeting of the 2021-2022 academic year will be held on **Thursday, January 20, 2022** at 3:15pm via Zoom (join after 3:00 pm at <https://wpi.zoom.us/j/96253469317>).

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Call to Order | M. Richman |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approval of the Agenda• Consideration of the Minutes from Dec. 2, 2021 | |
| 2. Committee Business (for discussion, only): | |
| Committee on Governance (COG) | T. El-Korchi |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Motion to modify the membership and election procedures for COG• Motion to establish an <i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Teaching and Research Faculty (CTRF) | |
| Committee on Governance (COG) | T. El-Korchi |
| Committee on Financial and Administrative Policy (FAP) | J. Fehribach |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Motion to revise the membership of the Comm. on Financial and Admin. Policy (FAP) | |
| 3. Special Report (and open discussion) | |
| The Challenges of Academic and Home Life: Current Reality and Future Hopes | G. Smith
J. deWinter
P. Rao
S. Stanlick |
| 4. President's Report | L. Leshin |
| 5. Provost's Report | W. Soboyejo |
| 6. New Business | |
| 7. Closing Announcements | |
| 8. Adjournment | |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Faculty Meeting Materials, January 20, 2022

	<u>Page</u>
1. Faculty Meeting Minutes: Dec 2, 2021	3
2. Committee Business (for discussion, only):	
COG Motions:	
- to modify the membership and election procedures for COG	9
- to establish an <i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Teaching and Research Faculty (CTRF)	13
COG and FAP Motion:	
- to revise the membership of the Committee on Financial and Administrative Policy (FAP)	15

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

Faculty Meeting Minutes

December 2, 2021

Summary:

1. Call to Order; Approval of the Minutes from September 30 and October 7, 2021 and the Consent Agenda
2. Committee Business: CAO, CGSR, CAP
3. Committee Report: CITP
4. President's Report
5. Provost's Report
6. Adjournment

Detail:

1. Call to Order

The fourth meeting of the 2021-2022 academic year was called to order at 3:15 pm on Zoom by **Prof. Richman** (AE). The meeting agenda, minutes from the September 30 and October 7, 2021 meetings, and the consent agenda were approved as distributed.

Prof. Richman (AE) drew attention to the fact that WPI had been named one of the two winners of the 2021 Delphi Award given out by USC's Pullias Center of Higher Education to rethink contingent nontenure-track faculty models, practices, and programs. The award recognizes all our work beginning in 2009 and especially the work we did between 2018 to 2021. It reflects well on all of us at WPI, in general, and is a shining example of our patient, deliberative, and transparent faculty governance process, in particular. We should be gratified by the external recognition that the Delphi Award brings to all of us at WPI.

Prof. Richman thanked all members of the Mental Health and Well Being Task Force (MHWBTF) for their extensive community outreach and for their efforts to compile an extensive list of possible short-term and long-term measures that we might take. He reported that the faculty governance committee chairs have met with the co-chairs of the academic subcommittee of the MHWBTF to discuss the role of the faculty in implementing any new academic policies and practices that would reduce student stress. Prof. Richman observed that these measures will invariably require more faculty time, so he hoped that the recommendations from the task force will be accompanied by commitments from the administration to devote the resources needed to deliver on our promises. He suggested that these commitments might include improving the student-to-faculty ratio, decreasing teaching loads, increasing the number of TA's, and rethinking our relationship with Workday. He also suggested that at the very least, we not place extra demands on faculty time, and hoped that this year's newly announce mandatory faculty annual report submission process could be simplified.

2. Committee Business

Committee on Academic Operations (CAO):

Prof. Totova (PH), on behalf of CAO, moved that the Registrar's list of undergraduate candidates as distributed be approved for December 30, 2021 graduation. **Registrar Miles** described two deletions from the distributed list, and **Prof. Burnham** (PH) asked Registrar Miles to verify that one student on the list had completed their MQP. The motion **passed** (as modified subjected to verification).

Committee on Graduate Studies and Research (CGSR):

Prof. Shell (BBT), on behalf of CGSR, moved that the Registrar's list of graduate candidates as distributed be approved for December 30, 2021 graduation. **Registrar Miles** described two deletions from and one addition to the distributed list, and **Prof. Troy** (BBT) and **Prof. deWinter** (HUA/IMGD) asked Registrar to Miles to see if two additional students should be added to the list. The motion **passed** (as modified subjected to verification).

Committee on Academic Policy (CAP):

Prof. deWinter (HUA/IMGD), on behalf of the Committee on Academic Policy (CAP), moved to adopt a policy to award posthumous undergraduate degrees to students who pass away during their enrollment at WPI. Prof.

deWinter described the procedure for awarding such a degree: after a student's death, the family initiates a request for degree conferral; the Provost or appointed delegate confers with the family, the President, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and with the Department Head, Program Directors, and advisors as appropriate; the Dean of UGS approves the student's inclusion in the graduating lists to be approved by the faculty; the Registrar creates a diploma with no notation of its being a posthumous degree; and the diploma is delivered in alignment with the family's request. Prof. deWinter described posthumous degree policies at several other institutions. By contrast to those policies, CAP's proposal does not require a minimum number of courses completed for the degree to be awarded. Instead, CAP's approach is to honor "dignity in death" rather than counting requirements. Prof. deWinter explained the reasons for this approach, including WPI's high retention and four-year degree completion rates, close connection among peers because of WPI's project-based curriculum, and the desire to provide both recognition to the deceased student and a form of closure to the family. The spirit of CAP's proposed policy, she concluded, was one of "radical compassion." (See **Addendum # 1** on file with these minutes.)

The motion **passed** unanimously.

Prof. Richman (AE) thanked CAP for its thoughtful, thorough, and prompt attention to this issue.

3. Committee Reports

Prof. Cowlagi (AE), for the Committee on Information Technology Policy (CITP), reported on IT policies related to the privacy of WPI community members. (See **Addendum # 2** on file with these minutes)

Prof. Cowlagi gave an in-depth description of the policies under discussion in CITP this year. He began with this relevant background: In 2019, the administrative Information, Security, Risk, and Compliance committee (ISRC) published a series of IT policies without formal input or approval from CITP. At least since AY 2019-20, CITP has been reviewing these policies to consider their impacts on academic matters and has consistently raised concerns about the potentially adverse impacts of these policies on the digital privacy of all WPI community members. Since the formation in spring 2020 of the Administrative Policy Group (APG), interactions between CITP and APG have been problematic. From spring 2020 until the beginning of the current academic year, the process for implementing IT policies was as follows: a draft of an IT policy would be sent by the originator (General Counsel or ITS, for instance) to CITP for review and recommendations; CITP would then send the draft with its recommendations back to the originator; after iteration in this fashion, the policy would be sent to APG, whose review included a 30-day community feedback process. CITP and APG each voted individually on identical policies, a procedure that was meant to arrive at consensus between APG and CITP and allow both committees to provide their independent and formal approval. At the last APG meeting, Prof. Cowlagi was told that the APG continues to want CITP feedback, but no longer wants CITP to vote on policies under review. This means that CITP will no longer have a role in formal approval of IT policies.

Prof. Cowlagi identified the three policies currently under discussion in CITP: Records Retention and Destruction Policy; Security Camera Policy; and Access to User Electronic Information Policy. These policies are published at <https://www.wpi.edu/about/policies> but have not been approved by CITP. Due to time constraints of today's meeting, Prof. Cowlagi discussed only the last two.

Prof. Cowlagi explained that the Security Camera Policy governs the use of over 300 security cameras that record video at various campus locations. In spring 2021, CITP (meeting #9), raised serious concerns about the policy. After consultation with Chief Martunas (Dir. Pub. Safety and Chief of Police), CITP submitted its recommendations. The revised draft of this policy was again reviewed by CITP (meetings #1 and #2 of AY 2021-22), which noted that while some issues were resolved, most of the serious concerns remain. These include the following: no distinction between public spaces and academic spaces (surveillance in classrooms and labs can threaten academic freedom); no assurance of notification to community members about the presence of cameras, especially when private areas such as offices fall under inadvertent surveillance; ambiguous language about real-time monitoring; a lack of clarity regarding who has access to recorded data and what procedures are used in releasing these data to external agencies; and a general lack of transparency regarding accountability and oversight of the usage of the recorded data. (See CITP minutes of meeting #2 AY 2021-22). CITP submitted to General Counsel and Campus Police its concerns and requested revisions on Oct. 3; the committee has not yet received an update.

Prof. Cowlagi explained that the Access to User Electronic Information Policy (AUEIP) governs how WPI accesses user electronic information (UEI) stored in, or transmitted through, any WPI system. The current policy defines “legitimate institutional purposes” for which ITS may access such UEI as emails (including drafts and attachments), voicemails, text messages, network logs, key-card access logs, wi-fi access logs, etc. “Legitimate institutional purposes” include systems protection, maintenance, and management; business continuity; safety matters; legal processes, including “threatened or pending litigation”; and internal investigations of misconduct. The policy defines an “authorizer” who authorizes access to UEI.

Prof. Cowlagi summarized the history of the current AUEIP. CITP had been reviewing a version of this policy in 2019 before APG was formed in spring 2020. APG’s 30-day comment period fell between May 5 and June 4, 2020. CITP’s 2019-20 annual report noted that APG’s process for reviewing the policy “took insufficient notice of CITP deliberations at the draft stage.” APG approved the policy in September 2020. The two faculty representatives on APG abstained. CITP did not vote to approve the policy at any time.

At the start of the current academic year, CITP began reviewing a new draft version of this policy (see CITP minutes, meeting #2, AY 2021-22). **Prof. Cowlagi** summarized serious CITP concerns, some of which relate to language in the current AUEIP. The general concern is that the policy language leaves loopholes making it vulnerable to abuse and creating risks of violations to the digital privacy of all WPI community members. As an example, he pointed out that the list of instances of access “is not intended to be exhaustive” and gives one person (the “authorizer”) authority to determine other reasons for accessing user data that “advance a Legitimate Institutional Purpose.”

Prof. Cowlagi reported that CITP has raised further concerns about the existing AUEIP: the policy defines an “Authorizer” but does not describe who will actually access the data; the section on “Internal Investigations of Misconduct” makes no reference to misconduct procedures written in the Faculty Handbook and the Student Code of Conduct; the policy language leaves loopholes that allow accessing UEI without authorization and without user notification. **Prof. Cowlagi** pointed out a conflict of interest in the policy’s Oversight Committee, which is constituted to review the policy, its implementation, and instances of access. While the policy lists the Office of General Counsel, Division of IT, and VP for Talent and Inclusion among the “Authorizers” of access to user information, three of these entities (Chief Information Officer, Deputy General Counsel, and VP for Talent & Inclusion) are also represented on the current Oversight Committee appointed by the President. (The other two members are the AVP of Academic Affairs and a Faculty Review Committee [FRC] appointee.)

Prof. Cowlagi explained that a “legal hold” by the university involves an involuntary preservation of UEI, so the user cannot delete their own email, drafts, OneDrive files, etc. On the one hand, the current AUEIP does not mention “legal holds.” But on the other hand, data from an available Oversight Committee report from Sept. 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021 indicates that implementation of the policy over the last year (Sept. 1 2020 to May 31, 2022) has included them. In addition, the new draft AUEIP removes the requirements for authorization, notification, and record-keeping for “routine” access. This practice may have already been in place last year.

Prof. Cowlagi concluded his presentation by noting that CITP continues to raise concerns about the adverse impacts of multiple policies on the digital privacy of all WPI community members. Given that some of these policies are currently published, **Prof. Cowlagi** indicated that community members should have no expectation of digital privacy at WPI.

Prof. Boudreau (HUA) asked for clarification about what is meant by “Internal Investigations of Misconduct”: are these limited to formal misconduct cases? And are they limited to the Investigatory phase of those misconduct cases? She also asked whether the policy defines “threatened or pending litigation.” **Prof. Cowlagi** explained that there is no further description of the term “threatened or pending litigation.” In response to Prof. Boudreau’s first questions about investigations of misconduct, Prof. Cowlagi read the text regarding misconduct investigations: “WPI may access user information in connection with investigations of misconduct by members of the WPI community, but only when the Authorizer, after weighing the need for access with other WPI values, has determined that such investigation would advance a legitimate institutional purpose and that there is sufficient basis for seeking such access. As described in another section of this policy, all decisions to access UEI are subject to review by an Oversight Committee.” **Prof. Boudreau** observed then that the misconduct policy does not need to be formally invoked for access to be authorized; **Prof. Cowlagi** agreed with this reading.

Prof. Fehribach (MA) asked if it were possible to revise the AUEIP to require that in any case when a user's private information is accessed for reasons not explicitly mentioned in the policy, the reason be disclosed publicly while observing needed confidentiality. **Prof. Cowlagi** noted that CITP is still providing its feedback and would include this suggestion as well.

Prof. Sturm (MA) thanked the committee for trying to understand and improve these concerning policies. He asked whether data is available on the use of security cameras on campus—whether and how often camera footage has been used for positive outcomes, and whether the use of such cameras has actually made the campus safer. **Prof. Cowlagi** stated that the committee has received no data or metadata on the camera use. He noted that last year when CITP reviewed the security camera policy, it recommended including oversight for metadata, but those recommendations were not incorporated into the new draft of the policy. **Prof. Richman** asked whether CITP lacks access to this data because the data doesn't exist or because CITP hasn't seen it; **Prof. Cowlagi** did not know whether IT maintains this sort of metadata.

Prof. DiBiasio (CHE) asked whether "access" pertains to personal devices (phones, laptops) using WPI WiFi. **Prof. Cowlagi** explained that the policy defines "WPI systems" as "all services, networks, and devices owned, provided, or administered by any unit of WPI," so although the policy does not include user owned devices, one would consider that user-owned devices connected to the WPI network are subject to access under the policy.

Prof. Spanagel (HUA) asked about the FRC appointee to the Oversight Committee. As this year's chair of FRC, he was unaware that a member serves on the Oversight Committee. He asked how the appointment was made and which FRC member serves. **Prof. Cowlagi** stated that CITP was told that Prof. Fabienne Miller was the FRC member on the Oversight Committee, though he doesn't know how that appointment was made.

Prof. El-Korchi (CEE) asked whether faculty and staff offices were considered private areas exclusively so that camera data is never collected from them. **Prof. Cowlagi** stated that those areas are considered private areas, but that CITP's concern was inadvertent surveillance. He indicated that the new draft policy does allow for the installation of a camera in a private area for specific legal purposes.

Prof. deWinter (HUA/IMGD) pointed out that research evidence shows that surveillance leads to alienation, anxiety and depression. She asked whether our campus concerns about mental health have entered the conversation about these policies, noting that the two discussed today involve degrees of surveillance. **Prof. Cowlagi** explained that CITP has submitted similar concerns to the policy authors in October, some based specifically on earlier input from Prof. deWinter.

Prof. Richman distinguished the issue of data access from that of user notification. He asked whether the policy indicates when an individual would be notified that their data had been collected, and if there were defined circumstances in which one would have one's data accessed but not be notified, or whether this decision is left entirely to the authorizer. **Prof. Cowlagi** replied that the policy states that the user should be notified, but because the list of legitimate institutional purposes was not exhaustive there are loopholes when the user may not be notified. **Prof. Richman** asked whether "legal holds" have been used in the past and what were the requirements for notification when a legal hold has been placed on a user's data. **Prof. Cowlagi** confirmed that CITP had been told that legal holds have been used in the past, but he explained that there is no mention of legal holds in the current policy so there are no rules about notification when they are used.

Prof. Pavlov (SSPS) wanted to know if class capture recordings were covered under the policies and if the recordings could be accessed under the AUEIP if subpoenaed. **Prof. Cowlagi** explained that those recordings are from ECHO 360 and are not from surveillance cameras, but he didn't think they were explicitly excluded from access.

Prof. Dominko (BBT) expressed her alarm that anyone's data at WPI could be accessed at any time for any purpose and suggested that the WPI faculty should be completely outraged that access to user information isn't regulated in a policy in such a way as to both protect the institution while also allowing it to do its jobs efficiently, appropriately, and with the freedom necessary for an academic institution. She described her upbringing in Yugoslavia, where "security" was defined using the same language she's heard in this report. Nothing she has heard today has assured

her that these policies are any different from practices 40 years ago across the Eastern Bloc. She expressed her dismay with ambiguous policies that excuse rather than regulate administrative access to user information.

Prof. Boudreau (HUA) stated that, though consensus is hard, she is disturbed to hear that the old way of collaborating “is no longer desired.” She pointed out a pattern she’s noticed: here, the Oversight Committee includes the people who wrote these policies and people who could authorize access: General Council, Chief Information Officer, and VP for Talent and Inclusion. She compared this to the proposed Board of Trustees bylaws, which stated that in cases of disagreement between the proposed bylaws and the Faculty handbook, the bylaws would “be controlling.” She noted a similar circularity in the APG process: while the APG supposedly considers administrative (not academic) policies, any question as to whether a policy is administrative is decided by the APG. She pointed out the dishonesty in the use of words like “oversight” when an Oversight Committee is effectively reviewing itself. Prof. Boudreau voiced her distress, noting that the faculty and administration should be working together, not working as enemies, to write policies that affect academics. In her view, these policies provide a structure for suspicion and hostility.

President Leshin objected that the comments completely misrepresent reality. She stated that Prof. Richman should put a stop to the discussion; she suggested that people should not be spending their time stirring everybody up with claims that anyone, anytime can access anyone’s information. She dismissed the claim as totally untrue, stated that the policies were being misrepresented to the faculty, and concluded that the misrepresentation was deliberate in order to stir things up when we should be working together. She noted that, despite the tone of today’s meeting, a policy was passed last year by the APG with the strong support of the Chair of CITP, and now it’s as if the world is ending. The APG has a process to gather input, and today we are listening to the faculty’s input. She noted that much of what the faculty have been told today is based on misunderstanding or outright lies. She assured the faculty that the administration doesn’t have time to run a surveillance state. She asked for everyone to take a breath, work together, and increase understanding. If that was the actual goal of this meeting, she said, we haven’t made much progress. She urged a different approach, not in a 200-person Zoom call where people are talking about Eastern Bloc countries and regimes, which in her view is ridiculous. She assured the faculty that no one at this institution is trying to surveil anyone.

Prof. Cowlagi pointed out for the record that nothing in his presentation was his opinion; it was all fact based on what is written in the policies and what was discussed at the CITP meetings. **President Leshin** reiterated that it was not true that anyone, anytime, anywhere can have their information compromised.

Prof. Fehribach (MA) noted the tendency for people creating these policies, particularly on the legal side, to try to work toward their client’s (WPI’s) interests and not always consider the interests of the other stakeholders. He suggested that more attention be paid to how the policies regulate people getting access to user information, and to whether enough regulation and disclosure is guaranteed. **President Leshin** added the phrase “checks and balances in reasonable ways,” explaining that it’s not always legal to disclose. **Prof. Fehribach** explained that he was talking in general ways, rather than about individual cases. So, if it is decided that access is needed in a category not identified in the policy, he suggested that there should be disclosure of this expanded category. **President Leshin** indicated that reasonable oversight is reasonable. **Prof. Fehribach** added that cases in which someone gained illegitimate access to information in a way that violates the policy should be disclosed with a description of the action taken against the violator. **Prof. Leshin** worried about whether each year, with a different chair of CITP, every policy would have to be revisited outside of the schedule for regular policy reviews. Her sense is that the APG, including the Chairs of FAP and CITP, are working through these policies, and that the concerns of the faculty will be incorporated. But it’s not helpful or true to claim that we’re living in a police state.

Prof. Richman suggested that if we are going to discuss these issues openly, the monthly faculty meeting is a healthy place to do so. He praised the hard work of CITP and **Prof. Cowlagi**, in particular, and he defended the right of people to express their opinions freely and honestly. He explained that in order to be open, we all need to listen to one another in that spirit and not dismiss comments as ridiculous. **President Leshin** defended her right to question the accuracy of comments. **Prof. Richman** observed that in an open discussion in this forum, if someone wishes to question the accuracy of a comment, it is proper to point to the policy and explain why the comment is untrue, rather than dismiss it with an epithet.

Prof. Richman concluded by thanking all those who participated in today's discussion.

4. President's Report

President Leshin expressed her appreciation for the free exchange of ideas and expressions of realistic concerns based in reality and her happiness to hear all such concerns. She observed that these issues are challenging, as WPI works to balance strong expectations from families of student safety on campus and the security of our community in an open campus environment. She appreciates the voices of faculty in that process, which she's trying to hear in a structured and collaborative way. She expressed her appreciation for those faculty who have worked on these policies and noted the challenges posed when committee chairs change. She explained that WPI is working to have more rigor around its policy environment.

President Leshin commented on the very challenging fall and expressed gratitude for the work the faculty do each day for their students in their classrooms. She asked that the faculty keep doing that work, keep trying to keep our community safe, and continue being accommodating and flexible with students. Pres. Leshin described her focus on the capital campaign; seeing the new academic building open for C-term; and implementing the strategic plan, which the Board enthusiastically endorsed in October. She wished everyone a happy holiday.

5. Provost's Report

Provost Soboyejo expressed his appreciation to the faculty for keeping our focus on the students and the community. He confessed difficulty listening to today's discussion and suggested that the total picture had not been presented. He acknowledged the concerns, but he said that none of the current policies discussed today were approved without extreme efforts to consult with faculty and the community. He urged the faculty to continue that process in the spirit of open dialogue.

Provost Soboyejo is looking forward to seeing the preliminary report of the Mental Health and Well Being Task Force (MHWBTF) in mid-December, and thanked MHWBTF co-chairs Dean King and Matt Barry and all its members. He looks forward to WPI working as a community to use those recommendations to guide our responses to promote the mental health of students, staff, and faculty. He hopes we'll come together in the new year as a community of free and open dialogue that works together to support our students and each other, and that continues to hold WPI and our students as its north star. He wished everybody a happy holiday season.

6. Adjournment

Prof. Richman thanked everyone for a worthwhile meeting, thanked the committee members (in particular those on CAO, CGSR, CAP, and CITP) for their hard work, joined the President and Provost in wishing everyone a safe holiday, and urged everyone to rest well during the term break.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark W. Richman, Secretary of the Faculty

Addendum on file with these minutes:

1. Addendum #1 - CAP, Adoption of policy to award posthumous undergraduate degrees - Minutes 12-2-21
2. Addendum #2 - CITP, IT Policies related to the Privacy of WPI Community Members – Minutes 12-2-21

For discussion (only) on Jan. 20, 2022:

Date: January 20, 2022

To: WPI Faculty

From: Committee on Governance (Prof. El-Korchi, Chair)

Re: Motion to modify the membership of and election procedures for the Committee on Governance to ensure nontenure-track faculty representation

Motion: The Committee on Governance recommends and I move that Part One, Bylaw One, (Membership, Duties and Responsibilities of Standing Committees of the Faculty), Section I (The Committee on Governance) of the Faculty Handbook be modified to update the membership of and election procedure for the Committee on Governance, as described below.

Description of the Motion:

The proposal would change Part One, Bylaw One, (Membership, Duties and Responsibilities of Standing Committees of the Faculty), Section I (The Committee on Governance) of the Faculty Handbook as follows:

Proposed Version:

Faculty Handbook: PART ONE; BYLAW ONE; Section I:

- I. The Committee on Governance (COG) consists of **four** elected **tenured** faculty members, **two** elected **secured nontenure-track faculty members**, one faculty member appointed by the President **in collaboration with COG to balance committee representation**, and, *ex officio*, the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty. **The full term for elected members is three years. The committee will select its Chair from its elected tenured members. A member may not serve as Committee Chair in more than two successive years.**

The election of COG members is conducted by the Secretary of the Faculty. Membership on this Committee is limited to no more than two faculty members from any one academic **department**. The election procedure is as follows. The Secretary prepares **separate** nominating ballots **as needed: one** listing eligible **tenured** faculty members by **department**; and **one** listing eligible **secured nontenure-track** faculty members by **department**. Faculty members may select up to five names from **each** list. **The final election ballot will consist of the names of the faculty members** receiving the largest number of nominations, who are also eligible and willing to serve. **The number of names on the final election ballot for tenured members will be five or twice the number of vacancies to be filled, whichever is larger and will contain no more than two names from any one academic department. The number of names on the final election ballot for secured nontenure-track members will be three or twice the number of vacancies to be filled, whichever is larger, and will contain no more than two names from any one academic department.** These ballots are distributed with voting instructions to all voting faculty members. **(If the highest vote getters from both the tenured faculty election and the nontenure-track faculty election are from the same academic department as a continuing member of COG, then to promote diversity on the committee, the winner is the nontenured faculty member when the continuing member is tenured, and the winner is the tenured faculty member when the continuing member is nontenured.)**

Vacancies that occur during the academic year are filled for the unexpired term by **the next highest vote getter in the previous COG election who is willing to serve.**

The election of the Secretary of the Faculty is conducted by COG. The Secretary of the Faculty must be a tenured faculty member. The election procedure is as follows. COG prepares a nominating ballot listing all eligible faculty members by department and distributes it to all voting faculty members, with instructions to select up to five names from the list. The two faculty members receiving the largest number of nominations who are willing to serve are then placed on a final election ballot distributed to all voting faculty members.

COG is responsible for offering nominations and for conducting the election of faculty members to standing and *ad hoc* Committees, except for the election of its own membership and that of the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom **and the Committee on Appointments and Promotions.** Each spring, COG will provide a ballot for the vacancies on each of the other standing Committees, after ascertaining the willingness of each nominee to serve. The ballot will also include names of those nominated by petition signed by five faculty members. Ballots will be distributed to each **voting** faculty member and returned to the Committee. The election procedure should be completed by the end of **D-Term.** COG has the jurisdiction to fill vacancies **that** may occur during the year in committees **that** come under its electoral jurisdiction. Such appointments will be only until the next annual election.

COG also receives from members of the WPI community requests for consideration of matters **that** do not appear to lie within the jurisdiction of existing Faculty Governance and the responsibilities of the Student Government, the Campus Judicial System, or the Administration. The Committee acts by attempting to resolve the issues itself, by referral to an appropriate person or group, or by creation of an *ad hoc* Committee.

COG is also responsible for the formulation of recommendations to the faculty on changes and additions to the Faculty Rules and Bylaws, and the Faculty Committee structure, as well as for the resolution of questions of jurisdiction of the Faculty Committees relative to each other. The Chair of COG serves as one of the faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees.

Current Version:

Faculty Handbook: PART ONE; BYLAW ONE; Section I:

- I. The Committee on Governance (COG) consists of five elected Faculty Members, one Member of the Faculty appointed by the President, and, *ex officio*, the Provost and the Secretary of the Faculty. Vacancies that occur during the academic year are filled for the unexpired term by special election from a ballot of candidates nominated at a Faculty Meeting. A Member may not be elected Committee chair in successive years.

The election of COG members is conducted by the Secretary of the Faculty. Membership on this Committee is limited to no more than two elected Faculty Members from any one academic discipline. The election procedure is as follows. The Secretary prepares a nominating ballot listing eligible Faculty Members by discipline and distributes it to all Members of the Faculty, with instructions to select up to five names from the list. The ten

Faculty Members receiving the largest number of nominations, who are also eligible and willing to serve, are then placed on an electing ballot which will contain no more than two names from any one academic discipline. This ballot is distributed with voting instructions to all Members of the Faculty.

COG is responsible for offering nominations and for conducting the election of the Secretary of the Faculty (when that office is vacant) and of Faculty Members to standing and *ad hoc* Committees, except for the election of its own membership and that of the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom. Starting in early spring, COG will provide a ballot for the vacancies on each of the other standing Committees, after ascertaining the willingness of each nominee to serve. The ballot will also include names of those nominated by petition signed by five Faculty Members. Ballots will be distributed to each Member of the Faculty and returned to the Committee. The election procedure should normally be completed by the end of Term C. This Committee has the jurisdiction to fill vacancies which may occur during the year in committees which come under its electoral jurisdiction. Such appointments will be only until the next annual election.

COG also receives from members of the WPI community requests for consideration of matters which do not appear to lie within the jurisdiction of existing Faculty Governance and the responsibilities of the Student Government, the Campus Judicial System, or the Administration. The Committee acts by attempting to resolve the issues itself, by referral to an appropriate person or group, or by creation of an *ad hoc* Committee.

COG is also responsible for the formulation of recommendations to the Faculty on changes and additions to the Faculty Rules and Bylaws, and the Faculty Committee structure, as well as for the resolution of questions of jurisdiction of the Faculty Committees relative to each other. The Chair of COG serves as one of the Faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees.

Summary of Proposed Changes:

The proposal includes the following substantive changes:

- Increases the number of elected COG faculty members from five to six;
- Guarantees that two of the six elected COG members will be secured nontenure-track faculty members, and modifies the election procedure accordingly;
- Requires that the remaining four elected members and the Chair of the committee be protected by tenure;
- Specifies that the President's appointment be made in collaboration with COG to address the balance of the committee membership;
- Allows the committee Chair to serve two (but not three) successive years.

The proposal also modifies the election procedure for COG members and codifies several current practices:

- Reduces the number of names that are required on the final election ballot(s);
- Simplifies the procedure for filling vacancies on COG consistent with the procedure used to fill vacancies on other standing committees;
- Includes current procedures for electing the Secretary of the Faculty;

- Recognizes that elections for standing committees are normally and should be completed by the end of D-Term rather than by the end of C-Term;
- Updates language to clarify that COG no longer offers nominations for the Committee on Appointments and Promotions.

Rationale:

The substantive changes in the proposal modify the membership of COG to guarantee that two of its six elected members (and two of its nine members, overall) will be secured nontenure-track faculty members. This is consistent with WPI's goal that roughly 80 percent of the voting faculty will be tenured or on the tenure track while 20 percent will be secured nontenure-track teaching faculty. Now that two slots on the committee will *always* be held by faculty members who are not protected by tenure, the proposal balances this guarantee by requiring that the remaining faculty members and the Chair of the committee be tenured members of the faculty. In this way, the proposal achieves a balance of representation consistent with the faculty make-up while at the same time it balances concerns about the need for the Committee on Governance to address difficult and sometimes confrontational issues.

The proposal further addresses the general issue of balanced membership by adding that the President's appointment to COG should be made in collaboration with COG and with the issue of balance of primary consideration. The proposal also allows the committee Chair to serve two successive terms. This change improves the continuity of the committee that may be needed for issues that sometimes take more than one year to consider, while it does not increase the total number of years that a member could serve as Chair.

The proposal includes several less substantive changes, as well. It counters the added complexity of the election process by reducing (from ten) the number of names required on the final COG election ballots. As redesigned, the ballots will *typically* have *more* than twice the number of candidates as vacancies, and the ballots will *always* have *at least* twice the number of candidates as vacancies. In addition, given the already elaborate two-stage COG election process (i.e. formal nomination followed by final election), the proposal eliminates an arcane and time-consuming procedure for filling vacancies on COG. In these two ways, the proposal both simplifies and preserves the special nature of the COG election.

Finally, the proposal simply codifies certain current practices: it explicitly includes current procedures for electing the Secretary of the Faculty; it recognizes that the elections for standing committees are normally and should be completed by the end of D-Term; and it updates language to clarify that COG no longer offers nominations for the Committee on Appointments and Promotions.

For discussion (only) on Jan. 20, 2022:

Date: January 20, 2022

To: WPI Faculty

From: Committee on Governance (Prof. El-Korchi, Chair)

Re: Motion to establish the Committee on Teaching and Research Faculty as a formal faculty governance mechanism added to address issues related to teaching and research faculty

Motion: The Committee on Governance recommends and I move that, following the procedure described in Part One, Section Three, Subsection III of the Faculty Handbook, the Committee on Teaching and Research Faculty (CTRF) be added as a formal *ad hoc* Committee of the Faculty.

Description of the Motion:

The proposal would establish the Committee on Teaching and Research Faculty (CTRF) as a formal *ad hoc* Committee of the Faculty with charge and membership described as follows:

The Committee on Teaching and Research Faculty (CTRF) is an *ad hoc* committee of the faculty that is concerned with and responsible for raising and addressing issues related *specifically* to teaching faculty and research faculty. It will be the responsibility of CTRF to apprise the appropriate faculty committees, including but not limited to COG, CTAF, and COAP, of any recommendations for new or modified policies proposed in their work. The committee works with COG and other appropriate committees both to bring such issues to the attention of the faculty and the administration, and to bring proposals for action by the entire faculty.

The five-person CTRF includes three elected members who either hold secured nontenure-track appointments or are tenure-track teaching faculty members. Elected members serve three-year terms. In addition, the committee includes the two elected nontenure-track faculty members serving on COG. The committee elects its Chair from among its three elected faculty members.

The committee will operate for three years as described above, publish minutes, and submit written annual reports of their academic-year activities to the Secretary of the Faculty within two weeks after the last day of each D-Term. Consistent with the procedures outlined in Part One, Section Three, Subsection III of the Faculty Handbook, after three years, the *ad hoc* committee will report to the faculty, whereupon - by action of the faculty - it will be extended for a designated time and purpose, reconstituted, eliminated, or established in an appropriate form as a permanent subcommittee of COG.

Rationale:

The proposal establishes a formal mechanism by which issues of concern *specific* to our teaching and research faculty members can be identified and addressed through our faculty governance processes. The work of the proposed committee is needed in the short-term as we consider issues and develop appropriate policy changes that arise from having only recently expanded participation in faculty governance. Additionally, in the next three years, this committee can assure

that issues specific to the teaching and research faculty will be addressed by those faculty members most affected by them.

At the same time, all campus-wide faculty issues, including those to be addressed by CTRF are best resolved with input from, and consideration by, the entire faculty. For this reason – as is the case when any issue overlaps the charge of several committees – the Committee on Teaching and Research Faculty will be responsible to work with COG and other appropriate governance committees, such as CTAF and COAP, to bring issues that CTRF identifies to the attention of and for action by the entire faculty.

Eligibility: The faculty members eligible to serve on the *ad hoc* committee are all full-time teaching faculty with the following titles: Instructor or Senior Instructor; Assistant, Associate, and (full) Teaching Professor; Professor of Practice; and Assistant, Associate, and (full) Professor of Teaching.

Implementation: Elections for this committee will be held by the end of D-Term 2022 with the elections for all faculty governance standing committees (except COG, CTAF, and COAP).

Date: January 20, 2022

To: WPI Faculty

From: Committee on Governance (Prof. Tahar El-Korchi, Chair)
Committee on Financial and Administrative Policy (Prof. Joseph Fehribach)

Re: Motion to revise the membership of the Committee on Financial and Administrative Policy (FAP)

Motion: The Committee on Governance (COG) and the Committee on Financial and Administrative Policy (FAP) recommend and I move that the current language describing Committee's membership, be revised (in Part One, Bylaw One, Section VI of the Faculty Handbook) as delineated below.

Details of the motion:

Current FAP Description: (Black text is unchanged; ~~strikethrough~~ words would be deleted, red would be added)

BYLAW ONE: MEMBERSHIP, DUTIES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY

VIII. The Committee on Financial and Administrative Policy (FAP) consists of ~~six~~ **eight** members in total: ~~three~~ **five** elected Faculty members (serving staggered three-year terms), the Chief Financial Officer, one additional administrative representative member designated by the President, and one additional Faculty member appointed by COG (for a one-year term, renewable for up to three consecutive years, in order to diversify the skills or perspectives needed by the committee, given the prospective composition of the committee that year). FAP informs the Faculty on administrative and financial matters that affect the Institute. FAP ascertains the interests and views of the Faculty concerning such matters, deliberates with appropriate access to institutional data, and works with the Administration to make recommendations that serve the best interests of the Institute.

(Amended by the Faculty, April 14, 2016; **Amended by the Faculty, xxx**)

Rationale:

The main purpose of expanding FAP's membership of Faculty members is to enable a more flexible and reasonable distribution of concurrent leadership roles that fall to the various FAP Faculty members. In addition to a Faculty member chairing FAP and attending other meetings as *ex officio* (Board of Trustees Budget and Finance, Administrative Policy Group, Annual Planning and Budget Process), FAP appoints one Faculty committee member to the Fringe Benefits Committee as the Chair – FBC, and another Faculty member to the Retirement Planning Committee – RPC. The remaining elected faculty member undertakes the role of the committee Secretary. Expanding the membership will allow for greater diversification of committee members and ensure sufficient membership to undertake additional committee responsibilities.

Implementation: New membership will be implemented following the upcoming Spring 2022 faculty elections to the standing committees. One new member will be elected for two years and another new member for three years.