

Committee on Governance Meeting Minutes
Meeting #16 (2016-17)
Tuesday, January 3, 2017, 10:15 am– 11:45 am
Faculty Governance Conference Room (SL 225)

In Attendance: Leonard Albano (Secretary), Tanja Dominko (Chair), Mark Richman, and Suzanne Weekes.

Absent: Provost Bruce Bursten, Glenn Gaudette, and Eleanor Loiacono.

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:15 am.
2. The agenda was approved as distributed.
3. Consideration of the minutes from Meeting #15 was deferred.
4. The remainder of the discussion concerned modifications to the motion (presented at the December 16th Faculty meeting) to revise the Faculty Handbook description of the Committee on Appointments and Promotions. Appropriate modifications were determined based on input received before, during, and after the December Faculty meeting.
 - a) The committee agreed to two modifications:
 - i. The role of the Nominator and the Advocate on each Joint Promotion Committee would be specified as *non-voting* members. A Joint Promotion Committee that formally includes the Nominator and the Advocate will ensure that in each case the Nominator and Advocate play a more significant role in the promotion deliberations. This will improve the level of communication between COAP members and those who best know the promotion candidate's qualifications. However, because the Nominator and Advocate will be selected by the promotion candidate in part because of their support of the promotion, they will serve as non-voting members of the Joint Committee. This addresses the concern raised that the candidate could "stack the deck" in his or her favor if the Nominator and Advocate were to serve as voting members.

Currently, four positive votes from the six COAP members are required for a positive recommendation for promotion. Any change to this practice may be proposed by COAP in a separate description of its promotion procedures.
 - ii. Responsibility to review initial appointments at the rank of Associate Professor was added back into the description of COAP's Roles and Responsibilities.
 - b) The committee discussed other issues, as well:
 - i. The consensus among COG members was that the formal role of the Department in the promotion process (if any) could be defined only after the role of the Department in mentoring/professional development is formalized. Therefore, for now the proposal would preserve the current possibility of a path to promotion without Departmental involvement.

- ii. The consensus among COG members was that it was too early in the evolution of the promotion process to consider expanding the eligibility for service on COAP beyond Faculty members holding the rank of Professor.
 - iii. The consensus among COG members was that the Faculty was positively disposed to broadening Faculty governance input in the process by which recommendations would be made for changes in criteria for promotion from Associate Professor to full Professor and for changes in criteria for appointment and promotion of continuing, non-tenure track faculty members. Therefore, the phrase “In collaboration with COG...” was not altered from the proposed description of the process for recommending changes to these criteria.
- c) The motion, in its modified form, will be circulated to all members of COG for additional review and committee approval before it is forwarded to the Faculty for the January 19th Faculty meeting.

5. The meeting adjourned at 11:45 am.

Respectfully,

Len Albano, Secretary